

Technical Memorandum

Public Draft

**Channel Capacity Report
2018 Restoration Year**



1 **Table of Contents**

2 **1.0 Executive Summary ES-1**

3

4 **2.0 Introduction..... 1**

5 2.1 Objective 2

6 2.2 CCAG Roles and Responsibilities 3

7 2.3 Channel Capacity Technical Factors 4

8 2.4 PEIS/R Approach to Minimizing Flood Risk 5

9

10 **3.0 Then-existing Channel Capacity Criteria..... 5**

11 3.1 PEIS/R Levee Criteria..... 6

12 3.2 Future Evaluation Process..... 7

13

14 **4.0 Study Area 8**

15 4.1 Reach 2..... 8

16 4.2 Reach 3..... 9

17 4.3 Reach 4..... 9

18 4.4 Reach 5..... 9

19 4.5 Eastside Bypass and Mariposa Bypass 10

20

21 **5.0 Data and Analytical Tools 14**

22 5.1 Restoration Hydrograph..... 14

23 5.2 Hydraulics 16

24 5.3 Sediment Transport 17

25 5.4 Geotechnical 18

26 5.5 Modeling Strategy..... 19

27

28 **6.0 Current Then-existing Channel Capacity 20**

29

30 **7.0 Completed Channel Capacity Studies and Related Work 21**

31 7.1 In-channel Capacity Study..... 21

32 7.2 Priority 1 Levee Geotechnical Assessment..... 27

33

1 **8.0 Recommended Then-existing Channel Capacities..... 35**

2 **9.0 Program Actions with the Potential to Improve Then-existing Channel Capacity 38**

3 9.1 Immediate Actions 38

4 9.2 Near-Term Actions 39

5 9.3 Long-Term Actions..... 40

6 9.4 Framework for Implementation 41

7

8 **10.0 Program Studies and Monitoring with the Potential to Inform Then-existing Channel**

9 **Capacity 43**

10 10.1 Technical Studies 43

11 10.2 Monitoring Activities..... 47

12

13 **11.0 Non-Program Actions and Studies that May Influence Future Channel Capacity..... 55**

14 11.1 Lower San Joaquin Levee District..... 55

15 11.2 Merced National Wildlife Refuge..... 57

16 11.3 DWR 58

17

18 **12.0 References..... 60**

19

20 **Tables**

21 Table ES-1 Current and Recommended Then-existing Channel Capacity..... ES-3

22 Table ES-2 Summary of In-channel Capacity for Each Side of Levee by River Reach ES-4

23 Table ES-3 Maximum Allowable Flows on Levees for the Gravelly Ford Study Area. ES-6

24 Table ES-4 Maximum Allowable Flows on Levees for the Middle Eastside Bypass Study

25 Area ES-7

26 Table 6-1 Current Then-existing Channel Capacity..... 20

27 Table 7-1 Summary of In-channel Capacity for Each Side of Levee by River Reach..... 24

28 Table 7-2 Priority 1 Maximum Allowable Flows on Levees for the Gravelly Ford Study

29 Area..... 33

30 Table 7-3 Priority 1 Maximum Allowable Flows on Levees for the Eastside Bypass Study

31 Area..... 34

32 Table 8-1 Current and Recommended Then-existing Channel Capacity..... 37

33 Table 9-1 Restoration Flow Limitations as it Relates to Agricultural Seepage.....40

34

35 **Figures**

36 Figure 4-1 San Joaquin River Restoration Program Location..... 11

37 Figure 4-2 San Joaquin River Reaches and Flood Bypass System..... 12

1 Figure 4-3 Flood Channel Design Flows 13
2 Figure 5-1 Restoration Flow Hydrograph at Friant Dam..... 15
3 Figure 7-1 Levee Schematic Defining Levee Features and In-channel Capacity 22
4 Figure 7-2 Gravelly Ford Study Area 29
5 Figure 7-3 Middle Eastside Bypass Study Area 30
6 Figure 7-4 Reaches with Maximum Allowable Flows of less than 4,500 cfs 32
7 Figure 10-1 Reach O Levee Improvement Sections (shown in Red) 44
8 Figure 10-2 Regional Subsidence Map..... 46
9 Figure 10-3 Current flow gages (purple) and staff gages (pink) available on CDEC 49
10 Figure 10-4 Channel Surface Differences 2008-2015.....50
11 Figure 11-1 Overview Map of Erosion Project Site 55
12 Figure 11-2 Photo of Erosion Site Prior to Repairs 55
13 Figure 11-3 Photo of Erosion Site After Repairs were Completed56
14

15 **Appendices**

16 Appendix A - PEIS/R Text Related to Channel Capacity
17 Appendix B - Reach 2A and Reach 2B Update - In-Channel Capacity Analysis
18 Appendix C – Reach 2A Update - Levee Capacity Evaluation of Geotechnical Gravelly
19 Ford Study Area
20

1 List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

2	CBBS	Chowchilla Bypass Bifurcation Structure
3	CCAG	Channel Capacity Advisory Group
4	CCR	Channel Capacity Report
5	CDEC	California Data Exchange Center
6	CFS	Cubic feet per second
7	CPT	Cone Penetration Test (Cone Penetrometer Test)
8	CVFPP	Central Valley Flood Protection Plan
9	CVFED	Central Valley Floodplain Evaluation and Delineation
10	CVFPB	Central Valley Flood Protection Board
11	Delta	Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta
12	DEM	Digital Elevation Model
13	DMC	Delta-Mendota Canal
14	DTM	Digital Terrain Model
15	DWR	Department of Water Resources
16	FSRP	Flood System Repair Project
17	GAR	Geotechnical Assessment Report
18	GDR	Geotechnical Data Report
19	GOR	Geotechnical Overview Report
20	GCR	Geotechnical Conditions Report
21	LMAs	Local Maintaining Agencies
22	LSJLD	Lower San Joaquin Levee District
23	LSJRFC Project	Lower San Joaquin River Flood Control Project
24	MNWR	Merced National Wildlife Refuge
25	NRDC	Natural Resources Defense Council
26	NOD	Notice of Determination
27	O&M	Operations and Maintenance
28	PEIS/R	Program Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental
29		Impact Report
30	Reclamation	Bureau of Reclamation
31	Restoration Area	San Joaquin River Restoration Program Restoration Area
32	RFMP	Regional Flood Management Plan
33	RM	River mile
34	ROD	Record of Decision
35	SJLE Project	San Joaquin Levee Evaluation Project
36	SJRRP	San Joaquin River Restoration Program
37	SPFC	State Plan of Flood Control
38	WSE	Water surface elevation
39	WSP	Water surface profile
40	USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
41	USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
42	USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
43	USJR	Upper San Joaquin River

1 **Definitions**

2 **San Joaquin River Restoration Program (SJRRP):** The SJRRP (also abbreviated as Program)
3 was established in late 2006 to restore and maintain fish populations in good condition in the
4 mainstem of the San Joaquin River (SJR) below Friant Dam to the confluence of the Merced
5 River, while reducing or avoiding adverse water supply impacts.
6

7 **Settlement:** In 2006, the SJRRP was established to implement the Stipulation of Settlement in
8 *NRDC, et al., v. Kirk Rodgers, et al.*
9

10 **Program Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (PEIS/R):** The
11 Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), as the federal lead agency under the National
12 Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Department of Water Resources (DWR),
13 the state lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), jointly prepared a
14 Program Environmental Impact Statement/Report (PEIS/R) and signed a Record of Decision and
15 Notice of Determination (ROD and NOD), respectively, in 2012 to implement the Settlement.
16

17 **Channel Capacity Advisory Group (CCAG):** The Channel Capacity Advisory Group provides
18 focused input to Reclamation’s determination of “then-existing channel capacity” within the
19 Restoration Area.
20

21 **Then-existing channel capacity:** The channel capacity within the Restoration Area that
22 correspond to flows that would not significantly increase flood risk from Restoration Flows in
23 the Restoration Area. This annual report will recommend updating then-existing channel
24 capacity based on recently completed evaluations.
25

26 **In-channel capacity:** The channel capacity at which the water surface elevation is maintained at
27 or below the elevation of the outside ground (i.e., along the landside levee toe).
28

1.0 Executive Summary

2 Background

3 The San Joaquin River Restoration Program (SJRRP) was established in late 2006 to implement
4 a Stipulation of Settlement (Settlement) in *NRDC, et al., v. Kirk Rodgers, et al.* The U.S.
5 Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal lead agency under the National
6 Environmental Policy Act, and the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), the State
7 lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, prepared a joint Program
8 Environmental Impact Statement/Report (PEIS/R) to support implementation of the Settlement.

9 The Settlement calls for releases of Restoration Flows, which were initiated in 2014 and are
10 specific volumes of water to be released from Friant Dam during different water year types,
11 according to Exhibit B of the Settlement. Federal authorization for implementing the Settlement
12 is provided in the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement Act (Act) (Public Law 111-11).
13 Reclamation signed the Record of Decision (ROD)/Notice of Determination (NOD) on
14 September 28, 2012. Both the PEIS/R and the ROD committed to establishing a Channel
15 Capacity Advisory Group (CCAG) to determine and update estimates of then-existing channel
16 capacities as needed and to maintain Restoration Flows at or below estimates of then-existing
17 channel capacities. Then-existing channel capacities in the Restoration Area (leveed reaches
18 within the San Joaquin River between Friant Dam and the confluence of the Merced River and
19 the flood control bypass) correspond to flows that would not significantly increase flood risk
20 from Restoration Flows. This Channel Capacity Report (CCR) is for the 2018 Restoration Year
21 and is the fifth report in a series of reports prepared annually. The 2018 CCR, prepared in
22 coordination with the CCAG, fulfills one of the commitments in the ROD/NOD for minimizing
23 flood risk from Restoration Flows.

24 The primary objective of this report is to provide the CCAG and the public a summary of the
25 prior Restoration Year's data, methods, and estimated channel capacities; and recommendations
26 for monitoring and management actions for the following year. Identifying then-existing channel
27 capacity is critically important to ensure the release of Restoration Flows would not significantly
28 increase flood risk in the Restoration Area. This report only considers flood risks associated with
29 levee failure when estimating then-existing channel capacity; all other potential material impacts,
30 including agricultural seepage, are addressed in other analyses but are also summarized in this
31 report.

32 CCAG Roles and Responsibilities

33 As described in the PEIS/R, the CCAG would be comprised of members from the Bureau of
34 Reclamation (Convener), California Department of Water Resources (DWR, Co-convener), U.S.
35 Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Lower San Joaquin Levee District (LSJLD), and the
36 Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB). The role of the CCAG is to: (1) provide

1 independent review of Reclamation’s estimates of then-existing channel capacity as needed; (2)
2 provide independent review of Channel Capacity Reports; (3) participate in CCAG meetings; (4)
3 provide independent and timely review of data; and (5) provide input and guidance on
4 monitoring and management actions. As of 2017, the USACE and CVFPB have declined
5 participation in the CCAG.

6 **Study Area**

7 This Channel Capacity Report focuses on the portion of the Restoration Area where levees exist
8 along channels to control flows. The leveed reaches on the San Joaquin River start at Gravelly
9 Ford (River Mile 226.9) and continue to the Merced River confluence (River Mile 118.2). The
10 study area also includes the Eastside Bypass from the Sand Slough Connector Channel to the
11 confluence with the San Joaquin River and the Mariposa Bypass.

12 **Findings and Recommendations**

13 Then-existing channel capacities are defined as flows that would correspond to the appropriate
14 levee slope stability and underseepage Factors of Safety based on USACE criteria for levees.
15 The application of the criteria requires the collection and evaluation of data at locations
16 throughout the Restoration Area. Until adequate data are available to apply the USACE criteria,
17 the release of Restoration Flows would be limited to those that would remain in-channel (the
18 water surface elevation in the river remains below the levees). There are two studies that were
19 included in the 2017 CCR to inform channel capacities for the 2017 Restoration Year: the *San*
20 *Joaquin River In-channel Capacity Analysis* (Tetra Tech, 2015b) and the Priority 1 Levee
21 Assessment. In the 2018 CCR, these two studies were updated to consider subsidence in Reach
22 2A and Reach 2B. Only the updates to those studies are included in this Report’s appendices.
23 The original studies are in the 2017 CCR and can be accessed from the SJRRP website.

24 A summary of the current and recommended then-existing channel capacity for the San Joaquin
25 River and flood bypasses are described in Table ES-1 below. In addition to consideration of
26 then-existing channel capacities, the release of Restoration Flows would also be limited by
27 agricultural seepage. The table also notes limitations in Restoration Flows based on agricultural
28 seepage. Details of how these seepage limits are determined and limit Restoration Flows are in
29 the *Seepage Management Plan*.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

**Table ES-1.
Current and Recommended Then-existing Channel Capacity**

Reach	Current Then-existing Channel Capacity (cfs)	Recommended Then-existing Channel Capacity (cfs) ¹
Reach 2A	6,000	6,000 ²
Reach 2B	1,120	1,210 ³
Reach 3	2,860	2,860 ⁴
Reach 4A	2,840	2,840 ⁵
Reach 4B1	Not Analyzed	Not Analyzed
Reach 4B2	930	930
Reach 5	2,350	2,350
Middle Eastside Bypass	580	580 ⁶
Lower Eastside Bypass	2,890	2,890
Mariposa Bypass	350	350

¹ Then-existing channel capacity shown in this table is based on levee stability only and does not consider Restoration Flow limitations related to agricultural seepage.

² Capacity not assessed for flows greater than 6,000 cfs. Restoration Flows are limited to approximately 2,140 cfs due to agricultural seepage.

³ Restoration Flows are limited to approximately 1,300 cfs due to agricultural seepage.

⁴ Restoration Flows are limited to approximately 900 cfs due to agricultural seepage.

⁵ Restoration Flows are limited to approximately 300 cfs due to agricultural seepage.

⁶ The recommended then-existing channel capacity reflects the typical board setting at the weirs that allows for flow diversions within the Merced National Wildlife Refuge. If all of the boards are removed from the weirs, the capacity could increase to 1,070 cfs. If all of the boards are placed in the weirs, Restoration Flows could not be put into the bypass without exceeding USACE criteria. Restoration Flows are anticipated to not be limited in this reach due to agricultural seepage.

15 **Current Channel Capacity Studies and Related Work Completed**

16 The following technical studies and related work have been completed for this year's report that
17 relate to channel capacities and were specifically evaluated to determine the recommended then-
18 existing channel capacities in this report.

19 **In-channel Capacity Study**

20 The *San Joaquin River In-channel Capacity Analysis* (Tetra Tech, 2015b) was performed to
21 determine in-channel capacity of the San Joaquin River and the Eastside and Mariposa bypasses
22 between Friant Dam and the confluence with the Merced River. The study incorporates ground
23 subsidence in significantly impacted areas of Reach 3, Reach 4A, and the Eastside Bypass and
24 geotechnical conditions of the levees in Reach 2A, Reach 4A, and the Middle Eastside Bypass.
25 This study was updated for the 2018 CCR to consider subsidence in Reach 2A and Reach 2B,
26 which is included in Appendix B. The in-channel flow capacity of each reach was determined to
27 be the highest flow rate through the reach where the water-surface elevation is at or below the
28 outside ground elevation for any part of the reach. Results for each reach are summarized in
29 Table ES-2. The in-channel capacity in reaches that did not previously have geotechnical data
30 inform the 2018 then-existing channel capacities provided in Table ES-1.

1
2

Table ES-2.
Summary of In-channel Capacity for Each Side of Levee by River Reach

Reach	Levee Side	In-channel Capacity ¹ (cfs)
Reach 2A	Left	1,900
Reach 2A	Right	1,500
Reach 2B (Entire Reach)	Left	0
Reach 2B (Entire Reach)	Right	0
Reach 2B (Excluding Mendota Pool) ²	Left	1,210
Reach 2B (Excluding Mendota Pool) ²	Right	1,670
Reach 3	Left	3,960
Reach 3	Right	2,860
Reach 4A (Inside geotechnical study area) ³	Left	980
Reach 4A (Inside geotechnical study area) ³	Right	1,340
Reach 4A (Outside geotechnical study area)	Left	2840
Reach 4A (Outside geotechnical study area)	Right	2840
Reach 4B2	Left	1,370
Reach 4B2	Right	930 ⁴
Reach 5	Left	2,350
Reach 5	Right	2,500
Middle Eastside Bypass (Eastside Bypass Reach 2) (Boards Out condition) ⁵	Left	10 ⁶
Middle Eastside Bypass (Eastside Bypass Reach 2) (Boards Out condition) ⁵	Right	340 ⁶
Lower Eastside Bypass (Eastside Bypass Reach 3)	Left	2,970
Lower Eastside Bypass (Eastside Bypass Reach 3)	Right	2,890
Mariposa Bypass	Left	650
Mariposa Bypass	Right	350

3
4
5
6
7
8
9

¹ Capacity based on outside ground elevations.

² Portion of reach above influence of Mendota Pool (about River Mile 209.5).

³ Includes the length of levee that was analyzed under the SJLE Project and is included in the Geotechnical Conditions Report (GCR). In-channel capacity results are superseded by the geotechnical assessment in the GCR.

⁴ Capacity excludes localized deep depressions, which would reduce capacity to 50 cfs.

⁵ Capacity assumes the refuge is not diverting flows and the weirs are not operating ("Boards Out").

⁶ In-channel capacity is essentially 0 cfs when the refuge is diverting flow and the weirs are operating ("Typical Boards" and "Boards In").

1 **Priority 1 Levee Geotechnical Assessment**

2 Levee evaluations along the San Joaquin River and flood bypasses are being conducted by DWR
3 to assess flood risks due to levee seepage and stability associated with the release of Restoration
4 Flows for the SJRRP. The evaluations were performed under DWR's San Joaquin Levee
5 Evaluation Project (SJLE Project) and included the exploration and evaluation of existing levees
6 within the Restoration Area that will be used to convey Restoration Flows. The evaluation would
7 allow the SJRRP to identify the maximum flow that can be conveyed on the levees without
8 exceeding USACE criteria for levee underseepage and slope stability.

9 In identifying the priorities of the SJLE Project, DWR classified levee segments in the
10 Restoration Area in one of three categories representing an increasing priority for the need to
11 complete the geotechnical evaluation and analyses. Priority 1 levees are located in Reach 2A
12 (14.9 miles) (Gravelly Ford Study Area); the Middle Eastside Bypass (from Sand Slough to the
13 Eastside Bypass Control Structure) (20.6 miles), and the lowest 4.1 miles of Reach 4A (Middle
14 Eastside Bypass Study Area).

15 The result of the SJLE Project evaluations was a maximum water surface elevation in 26 levee
16 reaches within the Reach 2A, Reach 4A, and Middle Eastside Bypass that can be conveyed by
17 the existing levees without exceeding USACE criteria. A hydraulic analysis to establish a
18 maximum flow capacity in these levee reaches was then performed on the results of the SJLE
19 Project analysis.

20 The geotechnical assessments, evaluations and identified maximum water surface elevation for
21 the identified reaches are summarized in Geotechnical Conditions Reports (GCR). Table ES-3
22 summarizes the maximum water surface elevation and respective allowable flows of at least
23 6,000 cfs that can be put into each reach of the levees within the Gravelly Ford Study Area
24 (Reach 2A). The ground elevations and water surface elevations in Reach 2A have been adjusted
25 to account for subsidence. The update is summarized in Appendix C of this report.

26

Table ES-3.

Maximum Allowable Flows on Levees for the Gravelly Ford Study Area

GCR Reach	GCR Station (ft)	Representative Model Cross Section	GCR Reference Elevation (ft)	Capacity (cfs)
Gravelly Ford Study Area (Reach 2A)				
A	11418+00	526981	174.8	>6,000 cfs
B	11560+00	541706	181.7	>6,000 cfs
C	11644+00	549708	184.7	>6,000 cfs
D	11708+00	555801	189.2	>6,000 cfs
E ¹				
F	11647+00	521166	171.9	>6,000 cfs
G	11742+00	532395	177.6	>6,000 cfs
H	11830+00	538908	181.7	>6,000 cfs

¹ Reach E was not evaluated due to the low height of the levee.

Table ES-4 summarizes the maximum water surface elevation and the respective allowable flows that can be put into each reach with the Middle Eastside Bypass Study Area (Reach 4A, Middle and Upper Eastside Bypass). This study area has been adjusted for subsidence and shows that five reaches have an allowable flow capacity of less than 4,500 cfs. Table ES-4 also shows the capacity of the Middle Eastside Bypass Study Area assuming conditions at the weirs within the Merced National Wildlife Refuge. If the weirs are not operating, it is known as the "Boards Out" configuration, and the capacity of the reach is about 1,070 cfs. If the weirs are operating in their typical configuration, known as the "Typical Condition", the capacity is reduced to 580 cfs. However, occasionally, all of the boards are placed into the weirs. This is known as the "Boards In" configuration, which essentially reduces the capacity of the reach to 0 cfs.

Table ES-4.

Maximum Allowable Flows on Levees for the Middle Eastside Bypass Study Area

GCR Reach	GCR Station (ft)	Representative Model Cross Section	Post-Subsidence		
			GCR Reference Elevation (ft) [post-subsidence]	Capacity (cfs)	
				Typical Boards	Boards Out
Eastside Bypass Study Area (Reach 4A and Middle Eastside Bypass)					
A	102000	60106	99.4	>4,500	>4,500
B	106500	64035	105.5	>4,500	>4,500
C	111000	69622	98.2	3,290	3,290
D	116400	73247	100.9	>4,500	>4,500
E	136100	93015	103.2	>4,500	>4,500
F	144600	101445	102.6	>4,500	>4,500
G	152300	107371	111.4	>4,500	>4,500
H	155500	108228	109.2	>4,500	>4,500
I	157000	109849	108.6	>4,500	>4,500
J	106000	61699	96.3	4,150	4,150
K	111830	67946	100.2	>4,500	>4,500
L	116800	72501	99.6	2,600	2,600
M	126500	82690	105.6	>4,500	>4,500
N	134500	90952	102.3	>4,500	>4,500
O	140500	96995	99.2	580 ¹	1,070
P	152500	109849	104.3	>4,500	>4,500
Q	937400	269381	109.7	>4,500	>4,500
R	926300	270685	107.3	>4,500	>4,500

¹ If all of boards are placed in the weirs at the refuge, the capacity of this reach is essentially 0 cfs.

1 **Future Program Actions with the Potential to Impact Then-existing** 2 **Channel Capacity**

3 Throughout Settlement implementation, the maximum downstream extent and rate of
4 Restoration Flows to be released would be limited to then-existing channel capacities. As
5 channel or structure modifications are completed with additional environmental compliance,
6 Restoration Flow releases would be correspondingly increased in accordance with then-existing
7 channel capacities and with the release schedule. If the release of water from Friant Dam is
8 required for flood control purposes, concurrent Restoration Flows would be reduced by an
9 amount equivalent to the required flood control release. If flood control releases from Friant
10 exceed the concurrent scheduled Restoration Flows, no additional releases above those required
11 for flood control would be made for SJRRP purposes. Until sufficient data are available to
12 determine the levee seepage and stability Factors of Safety, Reclamation would limit initial
13 Restoration Flow releases to those flows which would remain in-channel. When sufficient data
14 are available to determine the Factors of Safety, Reclamation would limit the release of
15 Restoration Flows to those flows which would maintain standard USACE levee performance
16 criteria at all times.

17 This report, similar to the previous years' reports, describes both the future Program studies and
18 monitoring and non-program actions with the potential to inform then-existing channel capacity.
19 The future Program technical studies include continued implementation of the SJLE Project
20 (includes geotechnical exploration and analysis), continued study and updates to the Reach 2A
21 Morphology Study (as needed), and continued subsidence monitoring and study. The Program
22 monitoring activities also continue to include: gage monitoring, water surface profile surveys,
23 aerial and topographic surveys, and vegetation surveys.

24 There are other entities that are active in the Restoration Area and whose programs may help
25 inform or impact then-existing channel capacity. The SJRRP will need to closely coordinate and
26 collaborate with these entities by sharing data and coordinating specific actions along the river
27 that can inform or impact channel capacity. These entities and activities include the LSJLD's
28 operation and maintenance of the bypass system and river channel, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife
29 Service operation of weirs within the boundaries of the Merced National Wildlife Refuge
30 (MNWR) along the Middle Eastside Bypass, and DWR efforts such as the Regional Flood
31 Management Planning, and the Flood System Repair Project. The SJRRP would continue to
32 coordinate with these non-Program efforts and actions, and the CCAG will consider the effect of
33 these actions in future Channel Capacity Reports.

1 2.0 Introduction

2 The San Joaquin River Restoration Program (SJRRP) was established in late 2006 to implement
3 a Stipulation of Settlement (Settlement) in *NRDC, et al., v. Kirk Rodgers, et al.* The U.S.
4 Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Federal lead agency under
5 the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the California Department of Water
6 Resources (DWR), the State lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act
7 (CEQA), prepared a joint Program Environmental Impact Statement/Report (PEIS/R) to support
8 implementation of the Settlement. The Settlement calls for releases of Restoration Flows, which
9 were initiated in 2014 and are specific volumes of water to be released from Friant Dam during
10 different water year types, according to Exhibit B of the Settlement. Federal authorization for
11 implementing the Settlement is provided in the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement Act
12 (Act) (Public Law 111-11). Reclamation signed the Record of Decision (ROD)/Notice of
13 Determination (NOD) on September 28, 2012. Both the PEIS/R and the ROD/NOD committed
14 to establishing a Channel Capacity Advisory Group (CCAG) to determine and update estimates
15 of then-existing channel capacities as needed and to maintain Restoration Flows at or below
16 estimates of then-existing channel capacities. Then-existing channel capacities in the Restoration
17 Area (the San Joaquin River between Friant Dam and the confluence of the Merced River)
18 correspond to flows that would not significantly increase flood risk from Restoration Flows.
19 Sections of the PEIS/R applicable to the CCAG are included in Appendix A of this report.

20 This Channel Capacity Report (CCR) for the 2018 Restoration Year (2018 CCR) is the fifth in
21 the series of annual reports required to fulfill the commitments in the ROD/NOD. The 2014,
22 2015, 2016, and 2017 Channel Capacity Reports can be found at the SJRRP website. The
23 previous report can be found at the following link:

24 [http://www.restoresjr.net/wp-content/uploads/Channel-Capacity-](http://www.restoresjr.net/wp-content/uploads/Channel-Capacity-Report_2017_final_508.pdf)
25 [Report_2017_final_508.pdf.](http://www.restoresjr.net/wp-content/uploads/Channel-Capacity-Report_2017_final_508.pdf)

26 The 2014 CCR was the first report to recommend then-existing channel capacities. The
27 capacities in these reports were based on limited information regarding levee stability and
28 subsidence. The 2016 CCR recommended then-existing channel capacities based on geotechnical
29 data in portions of Reach 2A, Reach 4A, and the Middle Eastside Bypass. The 2016 CCR also
30 included capacity changes in Reach 4A and the Middle Eastside Bypass as a result of subsidence
31 since 2008. The 2018 CCR also updates then-existing channel capacity as a result of subsidence,
32 but this time in Reach 2A and Reach 2B. This report will only include the new studies that were
33 completed this year to support then-existing channel capacities. Reports that support then-
34 existing channel capacities for the other reaches can be found on the SJRRP website. The report
35 also describes several data collection and study efforts that are expected to be completed in 2018
36 that will be used to inform subsequent reports.

37

1 The 2018 CCR will be available for a 60-day public review and comment period beginning on
2 September 19, 2017. Comments are due on November 20, 2017 to Reclamation and DWR and
3 may be mailed (hard copy or electronic) to the following:

4 Alexis R. Phillips-Dowell, Senior Engineer
5 Department of Water Resources, South Central Region Office
6 3374 East Shields Avenue
7 Fresno, CA 93726
8 Alexis.Phillips-Dowell@water.ca.gov

9 OR

10 Regina Story, Civil Engineer
11 Bureau of Reclamation, San Joaquin River Restoration Program
12 2800 Cottage Way, W-1727
13 Sacramento, CA 95825
14 rstory@usbr.gov

15 **2.1 Objective**

16 This Channel Capacity Report is required by the SJRRP PEIS/R and the corresponding
17 ROD/NOD. The primary objective of the report is to provide the CCAG and the public a
18 summary of the prior year's data, methods, and estimated channel capacities and the following
19 year's monitoring and management actions. In doing so, it will present data, evaluations,
20 estimates of then-existing channel capacity, and management actions to address levee stability,
21 hydraulics, and sediment transport within the system in accordance with levee performance
22 standards. Identifying then-existing channel capacity is critically important to ensure the release
23 of Restoration Flows in 2018 would not significantly increase flood risk in the Restoration Area.
24 This report only considers flood risks associated with levee failure when estimating then-existing
25 channel capacity. All other potential material impacts, including agricultural seepage, are
26 addressed in other analyses.

27 This report shall be prepared annually in coordination with the CCAG. The purpose of the
28 CCAG is to provide independent review of estimated then-existing channel capacities,
29 monitoring results, and management actions to address vegetation and sediment transport within
30 the systems as developed by the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation).

31

1 **2.2 CCAG Roles and Responsibilities**

2 The CCAG may be comprised of the following organizations:

- 3 • Bureau of Reclamation (Convener)
- 4 • CA Department of Water Resources (Co-convener)
- 5 • U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- 6 • Lower San Joaquin Levee District (LSJLD)
- 7 • Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB)

8 As of 2017, the USACE and CVFPB have declined participation in the CCAG.

9 Each organization shall designate a primary and secondary member. The roles and
10 responsibilities of the CCAG members are as follows:

- 11 • **Provide independent review of Reclamation’s estimates of then-existing channel**
12 **capacity as needed:** Provide an independent review of Reclamation’s estimated then-
13 existing channel capacities, monitoring results, and management actions to address levee
14 stability, hydraulics, and sediment transport within the system estimated by Reclamation in
15 accordance with standard USACE levee performance criteria.
- 16 • **Provide independent review of Channel Capacity Reports:** Annually or in the event
17 Reclamation proposes increasing the upper limit of releases for Restoration Flows,
18 Reclamation will release a public report detailing the new upper limits of releases and data
19 and methods used to develop the new upper limits of releases. The CCAG provides input
20 during the development of these public reports.
- 21 • **Participate in Channel Capacity Advisory Group meetings:** Reclamation organizes
22 working meetings for the CCAG to review progress made in developing the annual reports.
23 These meetings are an opportunity for the CCAG to comment on content as it is developed.
24 CCAG members attend and participate in working meetings.
- 25 • **Provide independent and timely review of data:** The CCAG provides a timely review of
26 data, analytical methodology, and results used to estimate the then-existing channel
27 capacities.
- 28 • **Provide input and guidance on monitoring and management actions:** Reclamation
29 provides occasional updates on on-going erosion monitoring and management results –
30 including monitoring of potential erosion sites – to the CCAG. The CCAG provides
31 comments on information provided through these updates.

32

1 2.3 Channel Capacity Technical Factors

2 There are several factors that can impact and limit channel capacity. The following is a summary
 3 of the factors that could be considered when evaluating and recommending then-existing channel
 4 capacities, as well as determining potential future improvements and other management actions
 5 of the SJRRP.

- 6 • **Levee Integrity** - Channel capacity may be limited if the levee is not constructed to design
 7 criteria (e.g., insufficient slope stability Factor of Safety or underseepage Factor of Safety) or
 8 if there is insufficient data to assess levee performance. In addition, observations (e.g., boils,
 9 sloughing, seepage, etc.) made of the performance of a levee during historical flow releases
 10 can also provide information on levee integrity and stability. These factors may result in
 11 recommendations to increase or decrease channel capacity.
- 12 • **Erosion** - Stream bank erosion that encroaches on the levee prism or has a significant
 13 potential to encroach on the levee prism increases the potential for levee failure. Therefore,
 14 channel capacity may be limited if erosion is present that could result in levee failure during
 15 a flow release.
- 16 • **Duration and Timing of Flow Releases** –The duration and timing of flow releases may
 17 cause water to be against a levee for a period of time which could result in the levee
 18 becoming saturated. As the levee becomes saturated, seepage through and sloughing of the
 19 soil can occur, which could result in the loss of foundation stability and ultimately potential
 20 levee failure.
- 21 • **Sediment Transport** - Sedimentation or scouring may change the geometry of the channel
 22 and increase or decrease channel capacity.
- 23 • **Subsidence** - Ground subsidence may change the geometry of the channel and increase or
 24 decrease channel capacity. Subsidence may also reduce freeboard, thus increasing the
 25 potential for overtopping during flow releases.
- 26 • **Vegetation** - In-channel vegetation may impact flow and stage and is measured by channel
 27 roughness in a hydraulic analysis. Changes in in-channel vegetation can increase or decrease
 28 channel capacity.
- 29 • **Operation and Maintenance** - Levee operation and maintenance (O&M) programs are
 30 necessary to assess changed conditions that could impact channel capacity and to provide
 31 flood fight capability in case of levee failure. Channel capacity may be limited if there are
 32 inadequate O&M resources to monitor conditions that could affect channel capacity.
- 33 • **Constructed Improvements** - Levee construction may improve levee integrity or channel
 34 geometry and increase channel capacity.
- 35 • **Additional Factors** - Other future conditions (i.e., climate change, structures, land
 36 encroachments, etc.) not listed above, or those recommended by the CCAG will also be a
 37 consideration in evaluating channel capacity.

38 The above factors, as well as others, are being considered as part of the current or future SJRRP
 39 studies and monitoring to determine then-existing channel capacity.

1 **2.4 PEIS/R Approach to Minimizing Flood Risk**

2 As outlined in the PEIS/R, Reclamation will minimize flood risk from Restoration Flows
3 throughout the Settlement implementation process by undertaking three integrated measures: (1)
4 establish a CCAG and determine and update the estimates of then-existing channel capacities as
5 needed; (2) maintain Restoration Flows below estimates of then-existing channel capacities; and
6 (3) closely monitor erosion and perform maintenance and/or reduce Restoration Flows as
7 necessary to avoid erosion-related impacts. The CCAG was established in coordination with the
8 Department of Water Resources (DWR) and prior to the release of Restoration Flows for the
9 2014 Restoration Year. Reclamation is to prepare an annual report, which would include data
10 and methods used to develop estimates of then-existing channel capacities. A draft report is
11 provided to the CCAG for its review and comment for a period of 60 days. In the event that
12 comments or recommendations are received from the CCAG within 60 days, Reclamation would
13 be required to consider and respond to such comments and prepare a final report for distribution
14 to the CCAG within 60 days of the close of the draft report review period. Reclamation will not
15 increase Restoration Flows above the previously determined then-existing channel capacities
16 until 10 days after the final report is prepared and distributed to the CCAG. Draft reports include
17 the data, methods, and estimated channel capacities; flow limits and any maintenance activities;
18 and monitoring efforts and management actions. Draft and final reports will be made available to
19 the public concurrent with their distribution to the CCAG. This report is the fifth in the series of
20 annual Channel Capacity Reports.

21 Reclamation will convene the CCAG as required until 2030, but may stop earlier, provided that
22 then-existing channel capacities are determined to equal or exceed the maximum proposed
23 Restoration Flows throughout the Restoration Area. If after 2030 then-existing channel capacities
24 decrease such that full Restoration Flows cannot be conveyed, the CCAG would be reconvened
25 and function as described above until such time that the then-existing channel capacities are
26 determined to equal or exceed the full Restoration Flows.

27 **3.0 Then-existing Channel Capacity Criteria**

28 Then-existing channel capacities, as defined for this report, consider levee stability and seepage,
29 but not other factors like agricultural seepage. This section presents the levee evaluation criteria
30 described in the PEIS/R for determining then-existing channel capacity and briefly describes the
31 process that will be used to collect data and perform analyses to determine levee conditions to
32 further refine then-existing channel capacity estimates.
33

1 3.1 PEIS/R Levee Criteria

2 An objective of the SJRRP is to minimize increases in flood risk due to the release of Restoration
3 Flows. To achieve this objective, the PEIS/R included the levee design criteria developed by
4 USACE in *Design and Construction of Levees Engineering and Design Manual (Manual No.*
5 *1110-2-1913)* (USACE, 2000), *Engineering Manual: Slope Stability (Manual No. 1110-2-1902)*
6 (USACE, 2003), and *Design Guidance for Levee Underseepage (Engineering Technical Letter*
7 *No. 1110-2-569)* (USACE, 2005). The levee design criteria and guidelines are to be applied
8 throughout the Restoration Area.

9 The levee criteria are included in the PEIS/R to reduce the risk of levee failure to less-than-
10 significant-levels by meeting levee slope stability and underseepage Factors of Safety. The
11 PEIS/R states that Restoration Flows should not cause the levee slope stability Factor of Safety
12 to be below 1.4, or the underseepage Factor of Safety to be reduced below the value
13 corresponding to an exit gradient at the (landside) toe of the levee of 0.5. The levee slope
14 stability Factor of Safety is defined as the ratio of available shear strength of the top stratum of
15 the levee slope to the necessary shear strength to keep the slope stable (USACE, 2003). The
16 application of the levee slope stability Factor of Safety of 1.4 is required for federally authorized
17 flood control projects. The underseepage Factor of Safety is defined as a ratio of the critical
18 hydraulic gradient to the actual exit gradient of seepage on the levee. USACE design guidance
19 recommends that the allowable underseepage Factor of Safety used in evaluations and/or design
20 of seepage control measures should correspond to an exit gradient at the toe of the levee of 0.5
21 (in general this would provide a Factor of Safety of 1.6), but states that deviation from
22 recommended design guidance is acceptable when based and documented on sound engineering
23 judgment and experience (USACE, 2005). The SJRRP will continue to coordinate with DWR,
24 CVFPB, and USACE to ensure appropriate methods and criteria are used in all levee evaluations
25 and design.

26 Until adequate data are available to determine these Factors of Safety, Reclamation would limit
27 the release of Restoration Flows to those that would remain in-channel. In-channel flows are
28 flows that maintain a water surface elevation at or below the elevation of the landside levee toe
29 (i.e., the base of the levee). When sufficient data is available to determine the levee slope
30 stability and underseepage Factors of Safety, Reclamation would limit Restoration Flows to
31 levels that would correspond to the appropriate levee slope stability Factor of Safety of 1.4 or
32 higher and an underseepage Factor of Safety corresponding to an exit gradient at the toe of the
33 levee of 0.5 or lower at all times. Implementing this measure would reduce the risk of levee
34 failure due to underseepage, through-seepage, and associated levee stability issues to less-than-
35 significant levels.

36 In addition, systematic levee condition monitoring would be implemented as described in more
37 detail in PEIS/R Appendix D, *Physical Monitoring and Management Plan*. Observation of levee
38 erosion, seepage, boils, impaired emergency levee access, or other indications of increased flood
39 risk identified through ongoing monitoring at potential erosion sites would indicate that the
40 minimum Factors of Safety are not met and would trigger immediate reductions in Restoration
41 Flows at the site. Such observations would supersede channel capacity estimates, and Restoration
42 Flows would be reduced in areas where these conditions occur.

1 **3.2 Future Evaluation Process**

2 The SJRRP will continue to complete and update the studies necessary to determine then-
3 existing channel capacity. This includes assessing channel capacity due to changes in the channel
4 as a result of observation, vegetation, subsidence and sediment, as well as collecting and
5 assessing the necessary geotechnical data to determine the appropriate levee slope stability and
6 underseepage Factors of Safety. To address the levee stability task, the San Joaquin Levee
7 Evaluation Project (SJLE Project) was initiated by DWR. The SJLE Project includes collecting
8 geotechnical data along the river and flood bypasses, evaluating the levee geotechnical
9 performance at various water surface elevations, and identifying levees and appropriate actions
10 to improve levee performance. The goal of this evaluation is to gain adequate information on the
11 levees to determine the levee slope stability and underseepage Factors of Safety. This will
12 provide Reclamation with the necessary information to make decisions on Restoration Flow
13 releases that will reduce the risk of levee failure. Details of the initial phase of results of the
14 SJLE Project, as well as other studies and monitoring that may be used to inform channel
15 capacities are summarized in Section 7 “Completed Channel Capacity Studies and Related
16 Work” and Section 10 “Future Program Studies and Monitoring with the Potential to Inform
17 Then-existing Channel Capacity.”

18

1 **4.0 Study Area**

2 The San Joaquin River originates from the Sierra Nevada Mountains and carries snowmelt from
 3 mountain meadows to the valley floor before turning north and becoming the backbone of
 4 tributaries draining into the San Joaquin Valley. It is California's second longest river and
 5 discharges to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) and, ultimately, to the Pacific Ocean
 6 through San Francisco Bay.

7 In 1942, Reclamation completed construction of Friant Dam on the San Joaquin River. With the
 8 completion of Friant-Kern Canal in 1951 and Madera Canal in 1945, Friant Dam diverted San
 9 Joaquin River water supplies to over 1 million acres of highly productive farmland along the
 10 eastern portion of the San Joaquin Valley. In 1959, construction of the Lower San Joaquin River
 11 Flood Control Project (LSJRFC Project) began. The LSJRFC Project was completed in 1967 and
 12 provides flood protection along the San Joaquin River and tributaries in Merced, Madera, and
 13 Fresno counties. The LSJRFC Project includes 108 river miles (RMs), 191 miles of levees, and
 14 protects over 300,000 acres. An additional 67 miles of non-Project levees also provide flood
 15 projection along the San Joaquin River.

16 The study area starts from the Friant Dam and ends at the confluence of the San Joaquin River
 17 with the Merced River. The Channel Capacity Report will focus on the portion of the study area
 18 where levees exist along channels to control flows. The leveed reaches on the San Joaquin River
 19 start at Gravelly Ford (RM 226.9) and continue to the Merced River confluence (RM 118.2). The
 20 study area also includes the Eastside Bypass from the Sand Slough Connector Channel to the
 21 confluence with the San Joaquin River and the Mariposa Bypass. The study area is shown in
 22 Figure 4-1.

23 The study area reaches are shown in Figure 4-2 and are describe below. Currently SJRRP flows
 24 pass through Reaches 1 through 4A, through the Sand Slough Connector Channel and into the
 25 Eastside Bypass, where they travel through Eastside Bypass before entering Reach 5 of the San
 26 Joaquin River. Since Reach 1 does not have levees, it is not the focus of the analyses included in
 27 this report and is not discussed further. The flood capacities of each of the reaches within the
 28 study area, as part of the overall flood control system are shown in Figure 4-3 (DWR, 1985).

29 **4.1 Reach 2**

30 Reach 2 marks the beginning of the LSJRFC Project levees and therefore the start of this report's
 31 study area. Reach 2 begins at Gravelly Ford and extends approximately 24 miles downstream to
 32 the Mendota Pool, continuing the boundary between Fresno and Madera counties. This reach is a
 33 meandering, low-gradient channel. Reach 2 is subdivided at the Chowchilla Bypass Bifurcation
 34 Structure (CBBS) into two subreaches. Both Reach 2A and Reach 2B were dry in most months
 35 prior to the SJRRP. Reach 2A is subject to extensive seepage losses. Reach 2B is a sandy
 36 channel with limited conveyance capacity. Reach 2A has a flood design capacity of 8,000 cubic
 37 feet per second (cfs) while Reach 2B has a flood design capacity of 2,500 cfs. In Reach 2B,
 38 seepage problems are reported to occur at discharges in excess of 1,300 cfs (McBain & Trush,
 39 2002). The levees in Reach 2B are not part of the LSJRFC Project. As part of the SJRRP,

1 setback levees are anticipated to be constructed in Reach 2B to increase its capacity to at least
2 4,500 cfs.

3 **4.2 Reach 3**

4 Reach 3 begins at Mendota Dam and extends approximately 23 miles downstream to Sack Dam.
5 Reach 3 conveys flows of up to 800 cfs from the Mendota Pool for diversion to the Arroyo Canal
6 at Sack Dam, maintaining year-round flow in a meandering channel with a sandy bed. This reach
7 continues along the boundary between Fresno and Madera counties. The sandy channel
8 meanders through a predominantly agricultural area, and diversion structures are common in this
9 reach. Reach 3 has a flood design capacity of 4,500 cfs. The levees in Reach 3 are also not part
10 of the LSJRFC Project. Flood flows from the Kings River are conveyed to Reach 3 via Fresno
11 Slough and Mendota Dam.

12 **4.3 Reach 4**

13 Reach 4 is approximately 46 miles long, and is subdivided into three distinct subreaches. Reach
14 4A begins at Sack Dam and extends to the Sand Slough Control Structure. Other than short 1-2
15 mile levee segments at the downstream end, levees in Reach 4A are not part of the LSJRFC
16 Project (Figure 3-3). This subreach is dry in most months except under flood conditions and
17 SJRRP flows. Reach 4B1 begins at the Sand Slough Control Structure and continues to the
18 confluence of the San Joaquin River and the Mariposa Bypass. Only the lower 2 miles of Reach
19 4B1 levees just upstream of the Mariposa Bypass are part of the LSJRFC Project. All flows
20 reaching the Sand Slough Control Structure are diverted to the flood bypass system via the Sand
21 Slough Connector Channel, leaving Reach 4B1 perennially dry for more than 40 years, with the
22 exception of agricultural return flows. Reach 4B1 has a flood design capacity of 1,500 cfs, but
23 the current channel capacity is unknown and could be zero in some locations (SJRRP, 2011). As
24 part of the SJRRP, setback levees may be constructed in Reach 4B1 to increase its capacity to at
25 least 475 cfs and possibly up to 4,500 cfs, depending on the alternative. Reach 4B2 begins at the
26 confluence of the Mariposa Bypass, where flood flows in the bypass system rejoin the mainstem
27 San Joaquin River. Reach 4B2 extends to the confluence of the Eastside Bypass. The levees in
28 this reach are all part of the LSJRFC Project. Reach 4B2 has a capacity of 10,000 cfs.

29 **4.4 Reach 5**

30 Reach 5 of the San Joaquin River extends approximately 18 miles from the confluence of the
31 Eastside Bypass downstream to the Merced River confluence. This reach receives flows from
32 Mud and Salt sloughs, and channels that run through both agricultural and wildlife management
33 areas. Much of Reach 5 includes levees that are within the LSJRFC Project. Reach 5 is the end of
34 the study area and has a flood design capacity of 26,000 cfs.

1 **4.5 Eastside Bypass and Mariposa Bypass**

2 The Middle Eastside Bypass (Reach 2) extends from Sand Slough Connector Channel to the
3 Eastside Bypass Control Structure. Flood flows from Reach 4A of the San Joaquin River and the
4 Upper Eastside Bypass (Reach 1) and the Chowchilla Bypass can be diverted into the bypass at
5 the head of this reach. The Merced National Wildlife Refuge (MNWR) is in the middle of this
6 reach of the bypass and diverts some flows to its Refuge by using two weirs. The Lower Eastside
7 Bypass (Reach 3) extends from the head of the Mariposa Bypass to the head of Reach 5, and
8 receives flows from Deadman, Owens, and Bear creeks. The Mariposa Bypass extends from the
9 Mariposa Bypass Control Structure to the head of Reach 4B2. A drop structure is located near
10 the downstream end of the Mariposa Bypass that dissipates energy from flows before they enter
11 the mainstem San Joaquin River. The flood design flow for the Middle Eastside Bypass (Reach
12 2) is 16,500 cfs; the Lower Eastside Bypass (Reach 3) is between 8,000 cfs at its upstream end
13 and 18,500 cfs just downstream of its confluence with Bear Creek; and 8,500 cfs for the
14 Mariposa Bypass. As part of the SJRRP, the Middle and Lower Eastside bypasses may be used
15 for Restoration Flows, but its overall design flood capacity will not be increased.





Figure 4-1.


San Joaquin River Restoration Program Location

1
2
3



1
2
3

Figure 4-2.
San Joaquin River Reaches and Flood Bypass System



1
2
3


Figure 4-3.
Flood Channel Design Flows

1 **5.0 Data and Analytical Tools**

2 The following sections describe the data and analytical tools used to determine then-existing
3 channel capacity. The sections provide an overview of the restoration hydrograph and hydraulic,
4 sediment transport modeling and levee assessment tools. Several of the tools are in the process of
5 being updated to incorporate additional data that has been collected since their initial
6 development. This section also includes a summary of the overall strategy Reclamation and
7 DWR developed for the coordination and application of the hydraulic and sediment modeling
8 tools.

9 **5.1 Restoration Hydrograph**

10 The SJRRP flow hydrograph involves a spring and a fall pulse with base flow releases of 350 cfs
11 from Friant Dam in the summer and winter months in most year types. These hydrographs are
12 provided in Exhibit B of the Settlement and the Restoration Flow hydrograph at Friant Dam is
13 summarized in Figure 5-1. Spring flow pulses range from 1,500 cfs maximum release in a
14 critical-high year type, to a 4,000 cfs release in a wet year type. The Restoration Administrator,
15 an independent individual called for in the Settlement, makes recommendations to the Secretary
16 of the Interior on how best to shape the hydrograph to meet the Restoration Goal of the
17 Settlement. The Restoration Administrator has the flexibility to adjust the hydrographs,
18 consistent with the Settlement, including releasing buffer flows of up to 10 percent, mobilizing
19 gravel with an up to 8,000 cfs pulse, and flexibly scheduling the spring pulse volume within a
20 period defined as 28 days in advance of the Settlement Exhibit B hydrographs (i.e., beginning on
21 February 1 with 500 cfs), and 28 days later than the Exhibit B hydrographs (ending on May 28 at
22 4,000 cfs). The fall pulse volume may be flexibly scheduled from October 1 to November 30. In
23 wet year types, an additional volume is available for riparian recruitment that can extend 60 to 90
24 days past the end of the spring pulse flow.
25



1 - NRDC v. Rodgers, Stipulation of Settlement, CIV NO. S-88-1658 - LK9CGGH Exhibit B, September 13, 2006
 2 - Hydrographs reflect assumptions about seepage losses and tributary inflows which are specified in the settlement

Figure 5 - 1

Restoration Flow Hydrograph at Friant Dam

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

In order to determine the Restoration Hydrograph, Reclamation will first use DWR forecasts to predict the unimpaired inflow to Millerton Lake. Then this volume is allocated to the Friant Division long-term contractors and water users in Reach 1 per Reclamation standard practice, and to the SJRRP using a methodology called Method 3.1 gamma. Reclamation then submits an allocation and a default flow schedule to the Restoration Administrator, with flow volumes by type (i.e., base flow, spring pulse, fall pulse, riparian recruitment). The Restoration Administrator responds with a flow recommendation using the flexibility as described above to change the flow schedule. Reclamation confirms that the Restoration Administrator recommendation is consistent with all applicable regulation (Settlement, Water Board Orders, channel capacity), accepts the recommendation, and then implements the schedule. For more information see the Restoration Flow Guidelines at the following website:

http://www.restoresjr.net/wp-content/uploads/SJRRP_RFG_v2.0_FINAL_508.pdf

Based on the schedule identified in the Settlement, Restoration Flows began on January 1, 2014. At present, because of seepage and possible levee stability issues, the river system is not capable of passing the full Restoration Flows, and so flows are released up to the then-existing channel capacity. This report provides Reclamation’s analysis of then-existing channel capacities, and the CCAG was formed to provide a peer review of that analysis in helping Reclamation determine the recommended Restoration Flows that can be released without significantly increasing flood risk. Preparation of this report and review by the CCAG will continue until such time that then-existing channel capacities are determined to equal or exceed the maximum proposed Restoration Flows throughout the Restoration Area.

The studies described in Section 7 “Completed Channel Capacity Studies and Related Work” evaluate a maximum flow of 4,500 cfs in each of the study reaches. This maximum flow is based

1 on the Settlement required capacity in Reach 2B and Reach 4B. Restoration Flows may be as
2 high as 8,000 cfs in the upper reaches to perform functions such as flushing spawning gravels,
3 but are expected to attenuate so not to exceed a maximum channel capacity of 4,500 cfs in Reach
4 2B.

5 **5.2 Hydraulics**

6 One-dimensional (1-D) steady-state Hydrologic Engineering Center's River Analysis System
7 (HEC-RAS) hydraulic models of the 150-mile reach of the San Joaquin River and Bypass
8 System between Friant Dam (RM 267.6) and the mouth of the Merced River (RM 118.2) were
9 developed and validated by Tetra Tech, Inc. (Tetra Tech) and DWR to support the SJRRP. Two-
10 dimensional (2-D) hydrodynamic models of all of the reaches except for Reach 5 were developed
11 by Reclamation. DWR also developed a site specific model of a 2.5-mile segment of the
12 downstream portion of Reach 2A. The following describes how these models were used to
13 evaluate channel capacity in this report.

14 **5.2.1 One-dimensional (1-D) Modeling**

15 The HEC-RAS hydraulic models provide a means of evaluating current 1-D hydraulic conditions
16 along the river and flood bypass system over a range of flows, including those specified in the
17 Settlement and flood events (Tetra Tech, 2014). The 1-D models have been used to perform a
18 number of analyses related to channel capacity, including:

- 19 • Assess channel capacities, including an evaluation of the degree to which sedimentation
20 would affect channel capacities in Reach 2A.
- 21 • Provide input to sediment-transport analyses, including an evaluation of the sediment-
22 transport behavior in Reaches 2A, 2B and 3; and the Eastside Bypass.
- 23 • Assess potential effects of Restoration Flows on levee underseepage, levee erosion and
24 stability, channel stability and flood carrying capacity.
- 25 • Assess the effects of subsidence in Reach 2A, Reach 2B, Reach 3, Reach 4A and the Middle
26 Eastside Bypass on channel capacity.

27 Most of the studies completed by the SJRRP, including estimating channel capacity, used
28 DWR's existing conditions HEC-RAS model of the river, which contains overbank topography
29 based on 2008 LiDAR mapping. Surveys by Reclamation and DWR have demonstrated that
30 considerable subsidence has occurred along Reach 3, Reach 4A, and the Eastside Bypass; and to
31 a lesser extent Reach 2A and Reach 2B. Using survey data collected in 2013 and 2014, DWR has
32 updated the models in those reaches to reflect subsidence. Using survey data collected in 2016,
33 DWR has also updated the models in Reach 2A and Reach 2B to reflect subsidence. These
34 models, until further updated, will continue to be used by the SJRRP in evaluating channel
35 capacity.

1 **5.2.2 Two-dimensional (2-D) Modeling**

2 Reclamation has developed 2-D hydrodynamic models for reaches 1B, 2A, 2B, 3, 4A, 4B1, 4B2
3 of the San Joaquin River and the Eastside Bypass. The 2-D models use the depth-averaged St.
4 Venant equations and an unstructured mesh to model water surface elevation, depth, and
5 velocities and report the above plus bed shear stress, critical sediment diameter, and sediment
6 transport capacity at each quadrilateral or triangular mesh cell. Applications of 2-D models for
7 channel capacity studies could include modeling of side channels, bank erosion, local flow
8 velocity and eddy patterns, as well as flow over in-channel bars and levees.

9 **5.3 Sediment Transport**

10 1-D and 2-D sediment transport models are also being employed by the SJRRP. These models
11 were developed to evaluate the effects of SJRRP actions on sediment transport along the river
12 and flood bypasses. The existing sediment transport models were developed using Reclamation's
13 SRH modeling system and incorporate the same foundational input data used in the hydraulic
14 models described above. In addition, DWR also developed an existing conditions sediment
15 model for much of the bypass using HEC-6T and HEC-RAS. These models were or will also be
16 employed to evaluate channel capacity as described below.

17 **5.3.1 1-D Modeling**

18 Reclamation developed SRH-1D sediment transport models to assess the reach-averaged erosion
19 and deposition impacts of the SJRRP to Reaches 1 through 5 in the PEIS/R. These models would
20 be useful for evaluating future channel capacity studies by simulating the future reach-averaged
21 sediment transport, erosion and deposition in the SJR and flood bypass system under various
22 flow routing scenarios. DWR also developed a mobile-boundary sediment-transport model using
23 HEC-6T of the bypass from the San Joaquin River Control Structure to the Eastside Bypass
24 Control Structure. Similar to the SRH-1D models, this model will be useful for evaluating the
25 long-term trends of aggradation and degradation in the bypass under Restoration Flow and
26 subsidence conditions. However, SRH-1D, HEC-6T, and other 1-D models are limited in their
27 ability to simulate local sediment transport conditions resulting from topographic variability
28 within a cross section, in river bends, around structures (such as bifurcations), and the
29 differences between channel and floodplain deposition.

30 **5.3.2 2-D Modeling**

31 Tetra Tech developed and calibrated a 2-D sediment-transport model for the approximately
32 2.5-mile reach immediately upstream from the CBBS. The model was developed to provide a
33 refined tool that can be used to predict the behavior of the downstream portion of Reach 2A and
34 to provide a more accurate estimate of sediment movement from Reach 2A through the San
35 Joaquin River Control Structure at the CBBS and into Reach 2B under various conditions (Tetra
36 Tech, 2013a). This model was used to complete a Reach 2A Sediment Study, which is

1 summarized in the 2014 Report. This model will likely continue to be used in future evaluations
2 of the sediment conditions within the vicinity of the CBBS.

3 **5.4 Geotechnical**

4 The seepage and stability analyses to evaluate levee impacts were performed using the 2-D finite
5 element software program SEEP/W, developed by GEO-SLOPE International, Ltd. The model
6 uses topographic and geotechnical data to analyze underseepage and excess pore-water pressure.
7 This is to determine exit gradients and the controlling water surface elevation that may result in
8 failure due to underseepage. The levee slope stability analysis was performed using SLOPE/W, a
9 2-D limit equilibrium stability analysis software program developed by GEO-SLOPE
10 International, Ltd. following the Spencer Method. The same topography used for the seepage
11 analysis was also used for the slope stability analysis. Pore-water pressures calculated by the
12 SEEP/W models are imported into SLOPE/W. The model uses effective shear strengths for the
13 different soil layers to determine the minimum factor of safety for surfaces that affect the overall
14 stability of the levee for different water surface elevations. The SEEP/W and SLOPE/W tools are
15 used in the geotechnical evaluations of the SJLE Project described in Section 7.2 and Section
16 10.1.1.
17

1 **5.5 Modeling Strategy**

2 Numerical modeling has been a key tool used by the SJRRP to develop designs for the site-
3 specific projects and perform quantitative evaluation of SJRRP actions. The SJRRP has
4 developed a set of hydraulic and sediment transport modeling tools to evaluate then-existing
5 channel capacity, as well as to complete other studies and actions implemented by the SJRRP.
6 Having separate tools available for different modeling applications provides the flexibility to
7 meet both efficiency and accuracy needs. No single model was deemed appropriate to effectively
8 model all aspects that are necessary to understand the actions of the SJRRP. The additional
9 complexity caused by employing different models that can generally meet similar objectives is
10 necessary to ensure that the appropriate models are being utilized for the appropriate purpose. To
11 allow for consistency in the application of the modeling tools, Reclamation and DWR have
12 developed a strategy memorandum specifically for the hydraulic and sediment transport
13 modeling. The strategy can be found in Appendix B of the 2015 CCR at the following website:

14 [http://www.restoresjr.net/download/program-documents/program-docs-
15 2015/CCAG_Report_Appendix_B_01132015_Accessible.pdf](http://www.restoresjr.net/download/program-documents/program-docs-2015/CCAG_Report_Appendix_B_01132015_Accessible.pdf).

16 The strategy will be updated, as necessary to reflect changes and updates to the modeling tools.
17 The strategy summarizes the models available, general differences, and preferred usage to
18 develop and evaluate SJRRP actions. Selection of the appropriate tool for any specific study,
19 including channel capacity, will depend on the purpose of the study, level of detail needed, and
20 the preference of the agency performing the analysis.

1 **6.0 Current Then-existing Channel Capacity**

2 For the 2017 Restoration Year, the SJRRP limited Restoration Flow releases to then-existing
 3 channel capacities recommended in the 2017 CCR. These capacities were based on the *San*
 4 *Joaquin River In-channel Capacity Study* (Tetra Tech, 2015b) and the Priority 1 Levee
 5 Geotechnical Assessment described in Section 7.0 of the 2017 CCR. Limiting Restoration Flows
 6 to these capacities reduced the risk of levee failure due to underseepage, and through-seepage.
 7 The current then-existing channel capacities are shown in Table 6-1.

8 **Table 6-1**
 9 **Current Then-existing Channel Capacity**

Reach	Current Then-existing Channel Capacity (cfs)
Reach 2A	6,000
Reach 2B	1,120
Reach 3	2,860
Reach 4A	2,840
Reach 4B1	Not Analyzed
Reach 4B2	930
Reach 5	2,350
Middle Eastside Bypass	580
Lower Eastside Bypass	2,890
Mariposa Bypass	350

10 These channel capacities will remain the same for this year's report with the exception that the
 11 capacity of Reach 2A and Reach 2B were updated to reflect subsidence. The following section
 12 includes the studies and related work that was completed to develop this update. Previous reports
 13 used to determine then-existing channel capacity can be accessed from the 2017 CCR on SJRRP
 14 website.
 15

7.0 Completed Channel Capacity Studies and Related Work

The following section summarizes the new technical studies and related work that has been completed at the time of publication of this report that relate to channel capacities. In the 2017 CCR, two studies were directly used to recommend then-existing channel capacities: the *San Joaquin River In-channel Capacity Analysis* (Tetra Tech, 2015b), and the Priority 1 Levee Geotechnical Assessment of levees within Reach 2A, Reach 4A, and the Middle Eastside Bypass. These studies have been updated to consider subsidence in Reach 2A and Reach 2B. These studies and their updates will continue to determine the recommended then-existing channel capacities. The updates are described below.

7.1 In-channel Capacity Study

The *San Joaquin River In-channel Capacity Analysis* (Tetra Tech, 2015b) was performed to determine in-channel capacity of the San Joaquin River and the Eastside and Mariposa bypasses between Friant Dam and the confluence with the Merced River. The study incorporates ground subsidence in significantly impacted areas of Reach 3, Reach 4A, and the Eastside Bypass and geotechnical conditions of the levees in Reach 2A, Reach 4A, and the Middle Eastside Bypass. This study provides the most recent in-channel capacities in all of the reaches with the exception of Reach 2A and Reach 2B, which were updated to consider subsidence in the 2018 CCR. Besides in-channel capacity for each reach the study also identified the approximate length of the left and right bank levee where the water surface elevation of 2,000 cfs and 4,500 cfs flows exceeded the outside ground elevation. The original study and the most recent in-channel capacity estimates for all of the reaches except Reach 2A and Reach 2B can be found in Appendix B of the 2017 CCR at the following website:

http://www.restoresjr.net/wp-content/uploads/CCR2017_Final-draft_Appendix-B_508.pdf.

The Reach 2A and Reach 2B in-channel capacity update is in Appendix B of this report. Both studies and updates are summarized below.

7.1.1 Methodology and Assumptions

The in-channel capacity was evaluated for each subreach that is bounded by levees in Reaches 2A, 2B, 3, 4A, 4B2, 5, Middle Eastside Bypass, Lower Eastside Bypass, and the Mariposa Bypass. As part of the SJRRP, new setback levees are being evaluated for Reach 4B1 to safely convey Restoration Flows. Since the current capacity is assumed to be negligible, it is assumed that no Restoration Flows will be conveyed in this reach until channel capacity improvements are made. Therefore, Reach 4B1 was not included in this analysis. Setback levees are also anticipated in Reach 2B, but because Restoration Flow releases will be routed through this reach prior to their construction, channel capacity was evaluated along the levees upstream from the direct impacts of Mendota Pool.

1 The 1-D HEC-RAS hydraulic models discussed in Section 5.2 “Data and Analytical Tools” were
 2 used for the analysis. The models in Reach 2A, Reach 2B, Reach 3, Reach 4A and the Middle
 3 Eastside Bypass were adjusted to consider subsidence. The magnitude of the elevation
 4 adjustments made to the models to account for subsidence for Reach 2A and Reach 2B ranged
 5 from less than 0.5 feet to 1.8 feet as shown in Appendix B (Figure 2). In Reach 2A, the
 6 downstream end of the reach near the CBBS is subsiding more than the upstream reach at
 7 Gravelly Ford. The subsidence in Reach 2B is occurring at a similar rate throughout the reach,
 8 with the downstream end near Mendota Dam subsiding about 0.5 ft more than at the CBBS.

9 To determine the outside ground to which the models results would be compared to determine
 10 in-channel capacities, the landside levee toe elevations were identified for each reach. In this
 11 analysis, the outside ground elevation adjacent to the landside levee toe was selected to represent
 12 the elevation of the landside levee toe. The elevations were identified at each hydraulic model
 13 cross-section primarily through inspection of the cross-sectional topography and were verified
 14 through review of the aerial photography, contour mapping, and topographic surveys. The
 15 outside ground elevations were selected for both the left and right levees. In-channel capacities
 16 reported in this analysis are based on water-surface profiles developed by running the models
 17 over a series of local flows. Figure 7-1 is a conceptual figure of the outside ground elevation
 18 location and the in-channel flow capacity.




Figure 7-1.

Levee Schematic Defining Levee Features and In-channel Capacity

19
 20
 21
 22

1 **7.1.2 Analysis and Results**

2 Computed water-surface profiles were compared to the outside ground elevations adjacent to
3 both the left and right levees along the extent of each reach. The in-channel flow capacity of each
4 reach was determined to be the highest flow rate through the reach where the water-surface
5 elevation is at or below the outside ground elevation for any part of the reach. Results for each
6 reach including the updates in Reach 2A and Reach 2B are described in the following sections
7 and are summarized in Table 7-1.

1
2

Table 7-1.
Summary of In-channel Capacity for Each Side of Levee by River Reach

Reach	Levee Side	In-channel Capacity ¹ (cfs)
Reach 2A	Left	1,900
Reach 2A	Right	1,500
Reach 2B (Entire Reach)	Left	0
Reach 2B (Entire Reach)	Right	0
Reach 2B (Excluding Mendota Pool) ²	Left	1,210
Reach 2B (Excluding Mendota Pool) ²	Right	1,670
Reach 3	Left	3,960
Reach 3	Right	2,860
Reach 4A (Inside Geotechnical Study Area) ³	Left	980
Reach 4A (Inside Geotechnical Study Area) ³	Right	1,340
Reach 4A (Outside Geotechnical Study Area)	Left	2,840
Reach 4A (Outside Geotechnical Study Area)	Right	2,840
Reach 4B2	Left	1,370
Reach 4B2	Right	930 ⁴
Reach 5	Left	2,350
Reach 5	Right	2,500
Middle Eastside Bypass (Eastside Bypass Reach 2) (Boards Out) ⁵	Left	10 ⁶
Middle Eastside Bypass (Eastside Bypass Reach 2) (Boards Out) ⁵	Right	340 ⁶
Lower Eastside Bypass (Eastside Bypass Reach 3)	Left	2,970
Lower Eastside Bypass (Eastside Bypass Reach 3)	Right	2,890
Mariposa Bypass	Left	650
Mariposa Bypass	Right	350

3
4
5
6
7
8

¹ Capacity based on outside ground elevations.

² Portion of reach above influence of Mendota Pool (about RM 209.5).

³ Includes the length of levee that was analyzed under the SJLE Project and is included in the Geotechnical Conditions Report.

⁴ Capacity excludes localized deep depressions, which would reduce capacity to 50 cfs.

⁵ "Boards Out" configuration assumes that the weirs used to divert flows into the MNWR are not operating.

⁶ In-channel capacity is essentially 0 cfs when the refuge is diverting flow and the weirs are operating ("Typical Boards" and "Boards In").

1 In **Reach 2A**, along the right and left levees, the highest local flow for which the water-surface is
2 at or below the outside ground elevation is 1,500 and 1,900 cfs, respectively (see Appendix B).
3 For about 4.7 miles of levees in this reach, the water surface at Restoration Flows of 4,500 cfs
4 would be at or above the outside toe of the levee. Generally, the impact of subsidence has been
5 fairly minor in Reach 2A compared to other reaches. However, because the downstream of the
6 reach is subsiding about 1 foot more than the upstream end of the reach, the in-channel capacity
7 is reduced. Section 7.2 describes an update to capacity considering geotechnical data and
8 analysis and subsidence in this reach.

9 In **Reach 2B**, outside ground elevations along the lower portion of this reach are generally lower
10 than the normal pool elevation at Mendota Dam (Figures 3 through 6 in Appendix B). The
11 hydraulic model and outside ground elevations have been updated to consider subsidence and the
12 in-channel capacity results in this reach are based on those updates. When considering the entire
13 reach, including Mendota Pool, the capacity along both sides of the channel is 0 cfs. As a result,
14 the existing flow capacity was evaluated for the entire reach as well as only for the portion of the
15 reach upstream from the influence of the pool. When only the portion of the reach upstream from
16 the influence of the pool is considered, the highest local flow in which the water surface is at or
17 below the outside ground elevation is about 1,210 cfs along the left levee and 1,670 cfs along the
18 right levee. In-channel capacities in this reach slightly increased after adjusting for subsidence
19 when compared to the capacities using the 2008 LiDAR. Because the upper portion of the reach
20 is subsided about a half foot or so less than the downstream portion near Mendota Dam, the in-
21 channel capacity increased slightly in the upper portion of the reach. The water surface at
22 Restoration Flows of 4,500 cfs would be at or above the outside toe of the levee (includes the
23 levees influenced by Mendota Pool) about 17.3 miles of levees in this entire reach. However, it
24 should be noted that model results show that at 4,500 cfs, portions of the levees are overtopped
25 under existing conditions and therefore would not convey 4,500 cfs.

26 In **Reach 3**, outside ground elevations are reasonably high along much of the reach except for an
27 area immediately upstream of Sack Dam (see Appendix B of the 2017 CCR). The hydraulic
28 model and outside ground elevations have been updated to consider subsidence and the in-
29 channel capacity results in this reach are based on those updates. Flow capacity in this area is
30 limited by a depression on the right side that has a capacity of 2,860 cfs. On the left side of the
31 channel, the capacity of the outside ground elevation is 3,960 cfs. For about 4.3 miles of levees
32 in this reach, the water surface at Restoration Flows of 4,500 cfs would be at or above the outside
33 toe of the levee. In general, subsidence has caused the overall slope in this reach to steepen,
34 which has increased capacity and reduced the length of levee that is at or below the outside toe
35 by 2.8 miles if subsidence since 2008 is not considered.

36 In **Reach 4A**, the maximum local flow for which the water-surface is at or below the outside
37 ground elevation for the levees is characterized both within and outside of where geotechnical
38 data has been collected. In addition, the hydraulic model and outside ground elevations have
39 been updated to consider subsidence and the in-channel capacity results in this reach are based
40 on those updates (Tetra Tech, 2015c). For the levees within the geotechnical study area, the
41 maximum local flow is 1,340 cfs for the right levee and 980 cfs for the left levee (see Appendix
42 B of the 2017 CCR). For levees outside of the geotechnical study area, the maximum local flow
43 is 2,840 cfs for both the left and right levees. In general, subsidence is causing the reach to

1 steepen and flatten out. At the downstream end of the reach, there is an area of subsidence that is
2 significantly greater than Reach 3, and the downstream portion of Reach 4A, creating a "bowl"
3 effect that has reduced capacity in the upstream portion of the reach. However, changes in in-
4 channel capacity as a result of subsidence are fairly minor. The overall length of levee where the
5 water surface elevation would be at or above the outside toe of the levee for 4,500 cfs is 19.7
6 miles, compared to 17.8 miles if subsidence since 2008 is not considered.

7 In **Reach 4B2**, the ground adjacent to the right levee in Reach 4B2 has many depressions, but
8 due to one localized and deep depression along the right levee, the in-channel capacity is limited
9 to about 50 cfs (see Appendix B of the 2017 CCR). Aerial photographs and contour mapping
10 indicate that these depressions are relatively small, and can contain water even at low flows,
11 which would not make them a levee stability issue. If these local, right-side depressions are
12 excluded from the analysis, the capacity along the right levee increases to 930 cfs. The outside
13 ground along the left levee is not as low, which results in an in-channel capacity of
14 approximately 1,370 cfs. For about 14.0 miles of levees in this reach, the water surface at
15 Restoration Flows of 4,500 cfs would be at or above the outside toe of the levee. Subsidence is
16 not significant in this reach, so in-channel capacities were not updated to consider subsidence.

17 In **Reach 5**, most of the areas with limited capacities occur along the mid- to upper- portion of
18 this reach, but one exception is a levee feature that exists along the left side of the channel near
19 the downstream end of the reach (see Appendix B of the 2017 CCR). This segment of levee does
20 not have a hydraulic connection to the main channel for flows up to 4,500 cfs. Therefore, this
21 levee segment was removed from the analysis. The highest local flow for which the water-
22 surface is at or below the outside ground elevation is 2,350 cfs and 2,500 cfs along the left and
23 right levees, respectively. For about 3.5 miles of levees in this reach, the water surface at
24 Restoration Flows of 4,500 cfs would be at or above the outside toe of the levee. Subsidence is
25 not significant in this reach, so in-channel capacities were not updated to consider subsidence.

26 In the **Middle Eastside Bypass**, at the upstream end of this reach, the channel bed is near the
27 elevation of the ground outside of the levees on both the right and left sides. The hydraulic model
28 and outside ground elevations have been updated to consider subsidence and the in-channel
29 capacity results in this reach are based on those updates (Tetra Tech, 2015a). There are two weirs
30 with boards located in the Middle Eastside Bypass that are used to divert water into the MNWR.
31 To provide information regarding the sensitivity of the weir settings on the in-channel capacities,
32 three weir configurations were evaluated. One configuration assumes that the upstream and
33 downstream weirs remain fully open. This condition represents the conditions of the boards
34 when the refuge is not diverting flows and is referred to as "Boards Out". The second weir
35 configuration is representative of the most typical setting of the boards that is required by the
36 refuge to divert flows during most years, and is referred to as "Typical Boards." The elevation of
37 the boards in this configuration is based on surveys that were conducted in 2015, and represents
38 a partial closure of the downstream weir, and the upstream weir remaining completely open. The
39 third weir configuration assumes that both the up- and downstream weirs are completely closed.
40 According to refuge staff, if water is available, the refuge will occasional place all of the boards
41 into the weirs so that they can fill the upstream ponds within the bypass. This condition is
42 referred to as "Boards In".

1 Under the Boards Out condition, the computed water-surface profiles indicate that the highest
 2 local flow for which the water-surface is at or below the outside ground elevation along the left
 3 levee is about 10 cfs, and along the right levee is 340 cfs (see Appendix B of the 2017 CCR).
 4 When there are "Typical Boards" or "Boards In" configuration, the in-channel capacity is
 5 essentially 0 cfs. These low in-channel capacities are the result of the low outside ground
 6 elevations compared to the channel bed. Subsidence has caused the reach to steepen for most of
 7 the reach, but there has also been a "bowl" of greater subsidence at the upstream end, which is
 8 where capacity is already an issue. Therefore, the overall capacity and the length of levee
 9 impacted have not significantly changed. For about 18.5 miles of levees in this reach, the water
 10 surface at Restoration Flows of 4,500 cfs would be at or above the outside toe of the levee.

11 In the **Lower Eastside Bypass** (Eastside Bypass Reach 3), the computed water-surface profiles
 12 indicate that the highest local flow for which the water-surface is at or below the outside ground
 13 elevation along the left levee is 2,970 cfs and along the right levee is 2,890 cfs (see Appendix B
 14 of the 2017 CCR). For about 3.6 miles of levees in this reach, the water surface at Restoration
 15 Flows of 4,500 cfs would be at or above the outside toe of the levee. Subsidence is not
 16 significant in this reach, so in-channel capacities were not updated to consider subsidence.

17 In the **Mariposa Bypass** along the left and right levees, the highest local flow for which the
 18 water-surface is at or below the outside ground elevation is 650 cfs and 350 cfs, respectively (see
 19 Appendix B of the 2017 CCR). As evident from the low in-channel capacity, the outside ground
 20 elevations in this reach are relatively low when compared to the main flow channel, but they are
 21 also relatively uniform throughout the entire reach. For about 6.6 miles of levees in this reach,
 22 the water surface at Restoration Flows of 4,500 cfs would be at or above the outside toe of the
 23 levee. Subsidence is not significant in this reach, so in-channel capacities were not updated to
 24 consider subsidence.

25 **7.2 Priority 1 Levee Geotechnical Assessment**

26 Levee evaluations along the San Joaquin River and flood bypasses are being conducted by DWR
 27 to assist the SJRRP in assessing flood risks due to levee seepage and stability associated with the
 28 release of Restoration Flows for the SJRRP. The evaluations were performed under DWR's
 29 SJLE Project (Section 10.1.1) and included the exploration and evaluation of existing levees
 30 within the Restoration Area that will be used to convey future Restoration Flows. The evaluation
 31 will allow the SJRRP to identify the maximum flow that can be conveyed on the levees without
 32 exceeding USACE criteria for levee underseepage and slope stability.

33 In identifying the priorities of the SJLE Project, DWR classified levee segments in the
 34 Restoration Area in one of three categories representing an increasing priority for the need to
 35 complete the geotechnical evaluation and analyses. Details of the specific tasks, including the
 36 methodology for prioritization of the levees are summarized in Section 10.1.2 of the 2014 CCR.
 37 Priority 1 levees are located in Reach 2A (14.9 miles), the Middle Eastside Bypass (from Sand
 38 Slough to the Eastside Bypass Control Structure) (20.6 miles), and the lowest portion of Reach
 39 4A (4.1 miles). The following section summarizes the geotechnical investigations for the Priority

1 1 levees, and the subsequent flow analysis to identify the maximum allowable flow that can be
2 conveyed on the levees in each reach.

3 **7.2.1 Geotechnical Investigations**

4 The initial phase of the SJLE Project included levee evaluations within two Priority 1 study
5 areas: 15 miles of levees in Reach 2A (Gravelly Ford Study Area) and 25 miles of levees along
6 the lower portion of Reach 4A and the Middle Eastside Bypass (Middle Eastside Bypass Study
7 Area). Figures 7-2 and 7-3 show the Gravelly Ford and Eastside Bypass Study Areas,
8 respectively.


9 The evaluations included reconnaissance-level geotechnical explorations, soils testing, and
10 seepage and stability analyses at multiple water surface elevations along multiple levee
11 segments. Geotechnical Conditions Reports (GCR) that includes the evaluations for both study
12 areas can be downloaded from DWR at the following link:

13 <http://www.dwr-lep.com/>.

14 Additional information regarding testing methodology is summarized in Section 7.2 of the 2017
15 CCR.

16

1



2
3
4
5

Figure 7-2.
Gravelly Ford Study Area




Figure 7-3.
Middle Eastside Bypass Study Area

1
2
3

1 7.2.2 Maximum Allowable Flow Analysis and Results

2 The result of the SJLE Project evaluations was a maximum water surface elevation in 26 levee
3 reaches within the Gravelly Ford and Middle Eastside Bypass Study Areas that can be safely
4 conveyed by the existing levees without exceeding USACE criteria. Hydraulic analyses to
5 establish a maximum flow capacity in these levee reaches were then performed on results of the
6 SJLE Project analysis.


7 In performing the analyses, 1-D hydraulic models (described in Section 5.2.1) developed for the
8 SJRRP were employed. The geometry in the existing-conditions hydraulic models are based on
9 2008 LiDAR overbank elevations and 2011/2012 in-channel bathymetry. To address recent
10 subsidence, the model geometry, and maximum water surface elevations from the GCR were
11 adjusted in Reach 4A and the Middle Eastside Bypass. In addition, for Reach 2A the model and
12 maximum water surface elevations were also adjusted for recent subsidence ranging from
13 0.4 feet at the upper end of the reach near Gravelly Ford to 1.5 feet near the CBBS. The
14 adjustments and updates to consider subsidence in Reach 2A are summarized in Appendix C of
15 this report.

16 A range of flows up to the full Restoration Flow of 4,500 cfs were modeled in the Eastside
17 Bypass Study Area and up to 6,000 cfs maximum flows for the Gravelly Ford Study Area
18 (Restoration Flow magnitudes above 4,500 cfs are possible to account for attenuation and flow
19 losses upstream of Reach 2B which will have a capacity of 4,500 cfs). All flows used in the
20 model were assumed to be local flows. The maximum water surface elevations at the assigned
21 model cross section were then used to interpolate a discharge based on flow profiles for the range
22 of flows. If the associated discharge was greater than 4,500 cfs in the Eastside Bypass Study
23 Area and 6,000 cfs in the Gravelly Ford Study Area, then a capacity of “>4,500 cfs” or
24 “>6,000 cfs” was reported and no further analyses was made. Similar to the In-channel Capacity
25 Analysis described in Section 7.1, the MNWR three weir configurations were considered.

26 The result of the Priority 1 levee evaluations of maximum flows showed that allowable flows in
27 Reach 2A after adjusting for subsidence remains just over 6,000 cfs throughout the entire reach
28 when considering levee seepage and stability. This capacity remains the same with and without
29 considering subsidence because the GCR elevations are still above the 6,000 cfs water surface
30 even after considering subsidence. However, future subsidence could reduce the capacity to less
31 than 6,000 cfs. In Reach 4A, the capacity of the evaluated portion of the reach was over 4,500
32 cfs. However, a few portions of the Middle Eastside Bypass cannot convey 4,500 cfs without
33 exceeding USACE criteria for levee seepage and slope stability. In this reach, four levee reaches
34 could not convey a 4,500 cfs without exceeding USACE criteria, including one 3-mile reach of
35 the right bank downstream of Sand Slough that can only convey flows up to 1,070 cfs without
36 exceeding USACE criteria. This reach is shown as Reach O on Figure 7-4. This reach, when the
37 MNWR weirs are operating with "Boards In", cannot convey any flow without exceeding
38 USACE criteria. When the weirs are operating in the "Typical Board" configuration, flows up to
39 580 cfs can be conveyed without exceeding USACE criteria. Figure 7-4 identifies all of the levee
40 reaches that do not convey at least 4,500 cfs and Tables 7-2 and 7-3 summarize the maximum
41 water surface elevation, and the respective allowable flows that can be put into each reach of the
42 Priority 1 levees. The Reach O levee improvements that are needed to release Restoration Flows

1 of up to 2,500 cfs are described in Section 10.1.1 of this report. These analyses are fully
 2 described in *Levee Capacity Evaluation of Geotechnical Gravelly Ford Study Area* (Appendix C
 3 of the 2017 CCR), and the Reach 2A Update (Appendix C of this CCR). The *Levee Capacity*
 4 *Evaluation of Geotechnical Middle Eastside Bypass (Reach 4A, Sand Slough Connector*
 5 *Channel, Upper and Middle Eastside Bypass) Study Area*, dated May 26, 2015 (Appendix D of
 6 the 2017 CCR).

7



8

9

Figure 7-4.

Reaches with Maximum Allowable Flows of less than 4,500 cfs

10

11

1
2

Table 7-2.
Priority 1 Maximum Allowable Flows on Levees for the Gravelly Ford Study Area

GCR Reach	GCR Station (ft)	Representative Model Cross Section	GCR Reference Elevation (ft)	Capacity (cfs)
Gravelly Ford Study Area (Reach 2A)				
A	11418+00	526981	174.8	>6,000
B	11560+00	541706	181.7	>6,000
C	11644+00	549708	184.7	>6,000
D	11708+00	555801	189.2	>6,000
E ¹				
F	11647+00	521166	171.9	>6,000
G	11742+00	532395	177.6	>6,000
H	11830+00	538908	181.7	>6,000

3
4

¹ Reach E was not evaluated due to the low height of the levee.

1
2

**Table 7-3.
Priority 1 Maximum Allowable Flows on Levees for the Eastside Bypass Study Area**

GCR Reach	GCR Station (ft)	Representative Model Cross Section	Post-Subsidence		
			GCR Reference Elevation (ft) [post-subsidence]	Capacity (cfs)	
				Typical Boards	Boards Out
Eastside Bypass Study Area (Reach 4A and Middle Eastside Bypass)					
A	102000	60106	99.4	>4,500	>4,500
B	106500	64035	105.5	>4,500	>4,500
C	111000	69622	98.2	3,290	3,290
D	116400	73247	100.9	>4,500	>4,500
E	136100	93015	103.2	>4,500	>4,500
F	144600	101445	102.6	>4,500	>4,500
G	152300	107371	111.4	>4,500	>4,500
H	155500	108228	109.2	>4,500	>4,500
I	157000	109849	108.6	>4,500	>4,500
J	106000	61699	96.3	4,150	4,150
K	111830	67946	100.2	>4,500	>4,500
L	116800	72501	99.6	2,600	2,600
M	126500	82690	105.6	>4,500	>4,500
N	134500	90952	102.3	>4,500	>4,500
O	140500	96995	99.2	580 ¹	1,070
P	152500	109849	104.3	>4,500	>4,500
Q	937400	269381	109.7	>4,500	>4,500
R	926300	270685	107.3	>4,500	>4,500

3
4
5
6

¹ If all of boards are placed in the weirs at the refuge, the capacity of this reach is essentially 0 cfs.

8.0 Recommended Then-existing Channel Capacities

The purpose of this section is to present the recommended then-existing channel capacities based on results from the current channel capacity studies summarized in the previous sections of this report. Then-existing channel capacities are defined as flows that would not significantly increase flood risk from Restoration Flows in the Restoration Area. To reduce this risk, the PEIS/R included levee design criteria for levee slope stability and underseepage Factors of Safety based on USACE criteria for levees. The application of the criteria requires the collection and evaluation of data at locations throughout the Restoration Area. Until adequate data are available to apply the USACE criteria, the release of Restoration Flows would be limited to those that would remain in-channel (the water surface elevation in the river remains below the levees).

Two studies were completed and updated to provide the best information to better inform channel capacities for the 2018 CCR: the *San Joaquin River In-channel Capacity Analysis* (Tetra Tech, 2015b) with update included in Appendix B of the 2018 CCR and the Priority 1 Levee Assessment summarized in Section 7.2 with update included in Appendix C of the 2018 CCR. The results in these two studies and subsequent updates were used to inform recommended then-existing channel capacities. This information uses in-channel capacity as the best estimate of then-existing channel capacities for Reach 2B, Reach 3, portions of Reach 4A, Reach 4B2, Reach 5, Lower Eastside Bypass and Mariposa Bypass. For Reach 2A, the lower 2.5 miles of Reach 4A and the Middle Eastside Bypass, adequate data was available to perform a geotechnical analysis and these results were used to determine then-existing channel capacity.

Based on the results summarized in Sections 7.1 and 7.2 and detailed in Appendices B and C of the 2017 CCR, and Appendices B and C of the 2018 CCR, the recommended then-existing channel capacities for the San Joaquin River and flood bypasses within the Study Area are described below.

- The recommended then-existing channel capacity for Reach 2A is at least 6,000 cfs based on the geotechnical data and a maximum water surface elevation on the left levee less than 1 mile upstream from the CBBS. After considering subsidence, there is no change from the then-existing channel capacity recommended in the 2017 CCR.
- The recommended then-existing channel capacity for Reach 2B considering subsidence and in-channel capacity is 1,210 cfs based on a low point along the left levee approximately 4.6 miles upstream of the Mendota Dam. The influence of the Mendota Pool was not considered because normal pool water surface elevations in the pool are already higher than some outside ground elevations adjacent to levees. Restoration Flows would not significantly change this water surface due to the requirements to operate Mendota Dam to maintain a relatively constant pool elevation. The then-existing channel capacity increased slightly from what was recommended in the 2017 CCR, when subsidence is considered.
- The recommended then-existing channel capacity for Reach 3 considering subsidence and in-channel capacity is 2,860 cfs based on a low depression along the right levee about 11.4 miles upstream of Sack Dam. There is no change from the then-existing channel capacity recommended in the 2017 CCR.

- 1 • The recommended then-existing channel capacity for Reach 4A considering subsidence, in-
2 channel capacity, and geotechnical assessment is 2,840 cfs, which is the in-channel capacity
3 of the reach outside of the geotechnical study area. The critical area is on the left and right
4 levees approximately 2 miles upstream of Sand Slough. There is no change from the then-
5 existing channel capacity recommended in the 2017 CCR.

- 6 • The recommended then-existing channel capacity for Reach 4B2 considering in-channel
7 capacity is 930 cfs based on the low ground elevation along the right levee approximately
8 one mile downstream of the confluence of the Mariposa Bypass. The three major depressions
9 were not considered in this or the previous analysis, which would limit the flow to 50 cfs,
10 since these depressions would likely fill with water and reduce levee stability concerns.
11 There is no change in then-existing channel capacity that was recommended in the 2017
12 CCR.

- 13 • The recommended then-existing channel capacity for Reach 5 considering in-channel
14 capacity is 2,350 cfs, based on a low point along the right levee near the downstream end of
15 the reach. There is no change in the then-existing channel capacity recommended in the 2017
16 CCR.

- 17 • The recommended then-existing channel capacity for the Middle Eastside Bypass
18 considering subsidence and geotechnical assessment is 580 cfs. This is based on a 3-mile
19 portion of the right bank downstream of Sand Slough. This flow assumes that the weirs are
20 configured and operated at their typical board setting ("Typical Boards") that is required by
21 the refuge to divert flows during most years. If the refuge is not diverting flows, the capacity
22 would increase to 1,070 cfs. On the rare occasion that all of the boards are in the weirs, no
23 Restoration Flow can be put in the bypass without exceeding USACE criteria. The then-
24 existing channel capacity recommended is based on the "Typical Boards" configuration,
25 geotechnical data and subsidence. There is no change in then-existing channel capacity
26 recommended in the 2017 CCR.

- 27 • The recommended then-existing channel capacity for the Lower Eastside Bypass considering
28 in-channel capacity is 2,890 cfs based on the low point along the right levee just downstream
29 of the Eastside Bypass Control Structure. There is no change in then-existing channel
30 capacity that was recommended in the 2017 CCR.

- 31 • The recommended then-existing channel capacity for the Mariposa Bypass considering in-
32 channel capacity is 350 cfs based on a low point along the right levee about 1.3 miles
33 upstream of the drop structure. There is no change in then-existing channel capacity that was
34 recommended in the 2017 CCR.

35 Table 8-1 summarizes the current and recommended then-existing channel capacities for each
36 reach of the San Joaquin River and the flood bypasses, as well as what study was used to
37 determine then-existing channel capacity. Then-existing channel capacities recommended above
38 do not consider limitations to Restoration Flows as it relates to agricultural seepage. For the 2018
39 Restoration Year, releases of Restoration Flows in Reach 2A, Reach 3, and Reach 4A are limited
40 by agricultural seepage, and not levee stability. Table 8-1 also notes current limitations of

1 Restoration Flows based on agricultural seepage. Details of how these seepage limits are
 2 determined and limit Restoration Flows are in the *Seepage Management Plan* described in
 3 Section 9.2.3.

4 **Table 8-1.**
 5 **Current and Recommended Then-existing Channel Capacity**

Reach	Current Then-existing Channel Capacity (cfs)	Recommended Then-existing Channel Capacity (cfs) ¹	Study that determines Then-existing capacity
Reach 2A	6,000	6,000 ²	Geotechnical Assessment (Table 7.2)
Reach 2B	1,120	1,210 ³	In-channel (Table 7.1)
Reach 3	2,860	2,860 ⁴	In-channel (Table 7.1)
Reach 4A	2,840	2,840 ⁵	Geotechnical Assessment (Table 7.3) and In-channel (Tables 7.1)
Reach 4B1	Not Analyzed	Not Analyzed	--
Reach 4B2	930	930	In-channel (Table 7.1)
Reach 5	2,350	2,350	In-channel (Table 7.1)
Middle Eastside Bypass	580	580 ⁶	Geotechnical Assessment (Table 7.3)
Lower Eastside Bypass	2,890	2,890	In-channel (Table 7.1)
Mariposa Bypass	350	350	In-channel (Table 7.1)

6 ¹ Then-existing channel capacity shown in this table is based on levee stability only and does not consider limitations to Restoration Flows
 7 related to agricultural seepage.
 8 ² Capacity not assessed for flows greater than 6,000 cfs. Restoration Flows are limited to approximately 2,140 cfs due to agricultural seepage.
 9 ³ Restoration Flows are limited to approximately 1,300 cfs due to agricultural seepage.
 10 ⁴ Restoration Flows are limited to approximately 900 cfs due to agricultural seepage.
 11 ⁵ Restoration Flows are limited to approximately 300 cfs due to agricultural seepage.
 12 ⁶ The recommended then-existing channel capacity reflects the typical board setting at the weirs that allows for flow diversions within the
 13 Merced National Wildlife Refuge. If all of the boards are removed from the weirs, the capacity could increase to 1,070 cfs. If all of the boards
 14 are placed in the weirs, Restoration Flows could not be put into the bypass without exceeding USACE criteria. Restoration Flows are
 15 anticipated to not be limited due to agricultural seepage.

9.0 Program Actions with the Potential to Improve Then-existing Channel Capacity

Throughout Settlement implementation, the maximum downstream extent and rate of Restoration Flows to be released would be limited to then-existing channel capacities. As channel or structure modifications are completed with additional environmental compliance, corresponding maximum Restoration Flow releases would be increased in accordance with then-existing channel capacities and the release schedule. Consistent with the commitments made in the PEIS/R ROD, Restoration Flows would be reduced, as needed, to address material seepage and levee stability impacts, as identified in the *Physical Monitoring and Management Plan* in Appendix D of the PEIS/R. If the San Joaquin River within the Restoration Area contains water other than Restoration Flows, concurrent Restoration Flows may be reduced such that the total flow does not exceed then-existing channel capacity. If flood control releases from Friant or other flood control facilities in the San Joaquin River system exceed the concurrent scheduled Restoration Flows, no additional releases above those required for flood control would be made for SJRRP purposes.

Until sufficient data are available to determine the levee seepage and stability Factors of Safety, Reclamation would limit Restoration Flow releases to those flows which would remain in-channel. When sufficient data are available to determine the Factors of Safety, Reclamation would limit the release of Restoration Flows to those flows which would maintain standard USACE levee performance criteria at all times.

The following sections identify potential immediate, near-term and long-term actions by the SJRRP that could affect then-existing channel capacity due to changes in the physical conditions within the Restoration Area. The listed potential actions and projects is not a comprehensive list, but a list of actions that may be implemented. Future actions listed in future annual channel capacity reports may change as monitoring is conducted and physical changes within the Restoration Area occur and are identified. If any actions increase then-existing channel capacities, a new Channel Capacity Report will be prepared prior to Reclamation increasing Restoration Flows.

9.1 Immediate Actions

Immediate actions are described at a project-level in the PEIS/R including specific details in the *Physical Monitoring and Management Plan* in Appendix D. Potential immediate actions to a reduction in channel capacity continue to include removal of vegetation and debris and/or restrictions on Restoration Flows that would exceed channel capacity.

Since the start of Restoration Flows, the SJRRP has implemented flow limitations and immediate flow reductions to address issues related to then-existing channel capacity, mainly for groundwater seepage and will continue to do so on an as-needed basis during the release of Restoration Flows.

1 Vegetation removal would be conducted by mechanical or chemical means. Nonnative plant
2 removal would receive priority over removal of native species. These responses could include
3 unplanned emergency actions or actions taken within the water year.

4 **9.2 Near-Term Actions**

5 In addition to immediate actions, the SJRRP is evaluating sediment, vegetation and operational
6 and maintenance projects that are being considered for implementation in the next couple of
7 years (near-term) to address the potential to maintain or increase then-existing channel
8 capacities. The following sections update the anticipated implementation schedules of the near-
9 term actions described in the previous year's 2017 CCR, as well as provide updates and future
10 activities related to levee stability and channel capacity summarized in the *Physical Monitoring*
11 *and Management Plan*.

12 **9.2.1 Vegetation Removal Projects**

13 Vegetation within the channel can reduce channel capacity by increasing channel roughness.
14 Vegetation management may be necessary to maintain then-existing channel capacities.
15 Reclamation is continuing to work with a local non-profit, the San Joaquin River Parkway and
16 Conservation Trust, to identify, manage, and monitor invasive aquatic and riparian species. The
17 existing program is anticipated to continue into the future.

18 **9.2.2 Operations and Maintenance Improvements**

19 Overall operation and maintenance including vegetation and sediment management, structure
20 and gate operations, levee stability and integrity of the San Joaquin River and flood bypasses can
21 impact then-existing channel capacity. Reclamation remains open to providing funding to help
22 the LSJLD adapt to changes in maintenance type and frequency as a result of Restoration Flows.
23 However, these funds have to be provided consistent with Federal Law.

24 **9.2.3 Seepage Management Plan**

25 Reclamation has developed a *Seepage Management Plan* and *Seepage Project Handbook* to
26 guide efforts related to groundwater seepage. It should be noted that the actions and findings of
27 the *Seepage Management Plan*, although related to channel capacity, is being reported as it
28 relates to agricultural seepage only. However, data collection and seepage projects will be
29 closely coordinated to determine effect on channel capacities. Reclamation releases Restoration
30 Flows in a manner that groundwater levels do not exceed thresholds that could cause material
31 adverse seepage impacts.

32 There are 92 groups of assessor parcels that may need seepage projects and will be evaluated for
33 impacts. Reclamation will be gradually implementing seepage projects by parcel group based on
34 flow restriction. Reclamation has implemented three projects to allow approximately 300 cfs to

1 pass through Reach 4A (subject to real time groundwater monitoring). Anticipated Restoration
 2 Flow limitations for each reach due to agricultural seepage for the 2018 Restoration Year is
 3 shown in Table 9-1.

4 **Table 9-1**
 5 **Restoration Flow Limitations as it Relates to Agricultural Seepage**

Reach	Seepage Management Plan Approximate Restoration Flow Limitations ¹ (cfs)
Reach 2A	2,140
Reach 2B	1,300
Reach 3	900
Reach 4A	300
Reach 4B1	Not Analyzed
Reach 4B2	--
Reach 5	--
Middle Eastside Bypass	--
Lower Eastside Bypass	--
Mariposa Bypass	--

6 ¹ Subject to real time groundwater monitoring.

7 The *Seepage Management Plan* and *Seepage Project Handbook* can be found at the SJRRP
 8 website under the following link:

9 <http://www.restoresjr.net/monitoring-data/groundwater-monitoring/>

10 **9.3 Long-Term Actions**

11 Long-term actions by the SJRRP will be needed to achieve then-existing channel capacities in
 12 the San Joaquin River and flood bypasses that can convey maximum Restoration Flow releases.
 13 Potential long-term actions could include, but would not be limited to, the following: providing a
 14 larger floodplain between levees through the acquisition of land and construction of setback
 15 levees; re-grading of land between levees; construction of sediment traps; sediment removal;
 16 levee improvements; construction of grade control structures; and channel grading.

17 Long-term actions would require a determination of need, identification for funding, and site-
 18 specific environmental compliance documentation. These actions would be considered by the
 19 SJRRP to allow the continued increase of then-existing channel capacity to meet full Restoration
 20 Flows.

21 The SJRRP is continuing to work on several long-term projects related to increasing site-specific
 22 channel capacity as provided for in the Settlement paragraphs 11(a) and 11(b). These projects
 23 include the following activities to be completed in future years:

- 1 • Construct Mendota Pool Bypass. The Compact Bypass would route flows and fish around
2 the Mendota Pool and would improve channel capacity to at least 4,500 cfs from Reach
3 2B to Reach 3. Additionally, the Mendota Pool Control Structure would allow for
4 deliveries into Mendota Pool, as appropriate. Pool operations would continue at the same
5 water surface elevation as it does now, and the project includes a fish screen to avoid fish
6 straying into Mendota Pool. Construction of this project is planned to begin in 2018. As
7 construction proceeds and the river slope equilibrates through the new bypass channel,
8 this reach will be an active site of erosion and deposition and may influence downstream
9 sediment transport. Though sediment transport modeling indicates that much of the
10 mobile sediment will move out the Restoration Area, monitoring stations are being
11 established to track the effects of Mendota Pool Bypass to key infrastructure and channel
12 capacity.
- 13 • Modify Reach 2B to convey at least 4,500 cfs. The channel would be modified to expand
14 its capacity to at least 4,500 cfs with integrated floodplain habitat. New levees would be
15 constructed to accommodate Restoration Flows, increasing the flood capacity of the
16 reach.
- 17 • Modify Reach 4B to allow for fish and flows. The Reach 4B Project consists of channel
18 and structural improvements in Reach 4B (the Reach 4B area is described as the San
19 Joaquin River and flood bypass channels between the Sand Slough Control Structure and
20 the confluence of the Eastside Bypass and Reach 5 of the San Joaquin River) to provide
21 fish passage and increased floodplain habitat to support the Restoration Goal of the
22 Settlement.
- 23 • Construct levee and fish passage improvements in the Middle Eastside Bypass (the
24 Eastside Bypass between the Sand Slough Control Structure and Mariposa Bypass). The
25 improvements that will impact channel capacity include reinforcing two miles of right
26 levee along the Eastside Bypass to improve levee stability and reduce seepage. This
27 improvement will increase Restoration Flows to at least 1,300 cfs in the reach. Another
28 improvement includes removing two weirs located in the Eastside Bypass and operated
29 by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to allow for fish passage.

30 **9.4 Framework for Implementation**

31 The long-term actions identified above are included in the SJRRP's draft *2015 Revised*
32 *Framework for Implementation* (Revised Framework). The Revised Framework is an update and
33 revision to the *Third Party Working Draft Framework for Implementation*, dated June 19, 2012
34 (2012 Framework), and establishes a realistic schedule for the Framework's "core" actions based
35 upon the best available technical, biological, schedule and funding information. Specifically, the
36 Revised Framework establishes the following:

- 37 • Five year visions to provide clear, realistic, and accomplishable steps towards meeting
38 the Restoration Goal and Water Management Goal;

- 1 • Achievable schedules based upon realistic Federal and State of California appropriation
2 levels, improving our ability to plan and be transparent on actions; and
- 3 • More clearly defined roles and responsibilities for each Implementing Agency, increasing
4 each agency’s ability to budget, plan, and approve construction actions.

5 This Revised Framework provides a more realistic schedule and associated future funding needs
6 for the SJRRP Implementing Agencies to focus on “core” actions identified in the 2012
7 Framework and Implementation of the Settlement and the Settlement Act. The Revised
8 Framework includes objectives to have 1,300 cubic feet per second of channel capacity
9 throughout the San Joaquin River to Reach 4A, the Eastside Bypass and Reach 5 by the end of
10 2019, 2,500 cfs of capacity by the end of 2024, and 4,500 cfs capacity by the end of 2029.
11 Channel capacity improvements include levee improvements identified by the remaining reaches
12 constrained by then-existing channel capacity, and groundwater seepage projects needed to
13 release flows without causing crop yield impacts. Approximately \$300 million of levee
14 improvement projects and \$189 million of seepage projects are included in the Revised
15 Framework, which combined total about a third of the total SJRRP cost.

16 The Revised Framework can be found at the SJRRP website under the following link:

17 http://www.restoresjr.net/wp-content/uploads/Revised-Framework_Final_20150729.pdf.
18

10.0 Program Studies and Monitoring with the Potential to Inform Then-existing Channel Capacity

There are several factors that can impact and limit channel capacity. Potential factors could include overall levee construction or integrity (e.g., insufficient slope stability factor of safety or underseepage factor of safety); flow duration and timing that could saturate the levee and cause instability; erosion of the stream banks that could cause potential levee failure; sedimentation or scouring; ground subsidence; and increased roughness from vegetation. Other future conditions, such as climate change and operation and maintenance while not directly impacting channel capacity, could have long-term impacts on overall performance of the conveyance system. These factors, as well as others were considered in developing SJRRP studies and monitoring to determine then-existing channel capacity. The following section summarizes the specific studies and data collection activities by the SJRRP to provide a better understanding of then-existing channel capacity or changes in in-channel capacity.

10.1 Technical Studies

The 2017 CCR described several future technical studies that build on the studies described in Section 7.0 “Completed Channel Capacity Studies and Related Work” and will provide additional information necessary to identify future then-existing channel capacities. The following describes the activities that are ongoing or may be conducted during the following Restoration Year.

10.1.1 San Joaquin Levee Evaluation Project

The SJLE Project assists the SJRRP in assessing flood risks associated with the SJRRP with respect to levee seepage and stability. As part of the work, DWR identified three priorities for levee evaluations representing an increasing priority for the need to complete geotechnical evaluations and analyses. DWR has completed its evaluation of Priority 1 levees and recently completed a *Seepage And Stability Assessment For Geotechnical Basis Of Design Report* (GBOD Report) for three segments within a three-mile area of the right existing levee in the Middle Eastside Bypass. This levee was the only levee that initial evaluations indicated will exceed USACE criteria for underseepage at a target Restoration Flow release of 1,300 cfs.

The GBOD Report summarized the data collection, evaluation, and the preliminary design to allow the reach to convey Restoration Flow releases of greater than 1,300 cfs from Friant Dam. Two alternative solutions included seepage berms and slurry walls to provide levee seepage and stability. The three levee segments identified as O-1, O-3, and O-4 are shown in Figure 10-1.




Figure 10-1.

Reach O Levee Improvement Sections (shown in Red)

1
2
3

DWR is also continuing the exploration of Priority 2 levees to inform the SJRRP of future remediation needs and costs. Priority 2 evaluations are currently being performed on about 30 miles of levees in Reach 4B2 and the Mariposa Bypass. The explorations, including 152 bore holes, CPTs, geophysical surveys, and testing of the soils data has been completed. The evaluations and determination of capacities for these reaches will continue into 2018.

10.1.2 Reach 2A Morphology Study

The Reach 2A Sediment Study was carried out in the lower portion of Reach 2A to investigate sediment deposition upstream from the CBBS, which may have been a result of the 2009 through 2011 Restoration and 2011 flood flow releases. The study showed that in the short-term, Restoration Flows did not have a significant impact on channel capacity in the lower portion of Reach 2A. Significant flood flow releases from Friant Dam in the winter of 2016, and spring and summer of 2017 will change the sediment deposition upstream of the CBBS. Continued monitoring may be conducted to improve understanding of longer term impacts and to test the hypothesis that Restoration Flows will continue the pattern of general degradation throughout Reach 2A, but that deposition will continue to occur immediately upstream of the CBBS. This study would help the SJRRP determine the short-term and long-term channel response in Reach 2A and its potential impact on then-existing channel capacity, as well as on operation of the CBBS. This information can also be used to assess the potential need to change then-existing channel capacity in Reach 2A or to take immediate or long term-actions. The initial study was

22

1 described in Section 7.3 of the 2014 CCR; a summary of the potential work that could be
2 completed is in Section 10.1.3 of the 2014 CCR.

3 **10.1.3 Subsidence Monitoring and Studies**


4 Previous channel capacity reports include a description of the methods and results of the
5 subsidence monitoring and levee surveys completed from 2011 to 2013 by Reclamation, Mid-
6 Pacific Region, Division of Design and Construction, Surveys and Mapping Branch (MP-220)
7 and the California Department of Water Resources, South Central Region Office (DWR-SCRO)
8 for the SJRRP. Additional details are also provided in *Technical Memorandum, Subsidence*
9 *Monitoring*, dated September 2014 and prepared by DWR and Reclamation that are included in
10 the 2015 CCR (Attachment E). The results of the monitoring continued to be used to study
11 subsidence within the Restoration Area and to support the various studies that will help the
12 SJRRP determine changes in then-existing channel capacities as a result of subsidence. The
13 following sections provide an update to the monitoring and study efforts.

14 ***Reclamation Geodetic Control Network***

15 In 2011, Reclamation established the SJRRP Geodetic Control Network, using static GPS
16 methods, to investigate subsidence within the Restoration and surrounding study areas. To
17 monitor the rate of subsidence over time, Reclamation conducts bi-annual surveys, in July and
18 December, of the established network made up of 85 control points. The control point elevations
19 are updated after each survey and are used by the SJRRP to study subsidence, as well as to
20 provide more accurate horizontal and vertical control for other studies.

21 After each survey, Reclamation prepares exhibit maps that compare the most recent data with the
22 data from the previous survey, as well as from previous years. The exhibit maps give a good
23 overall picture of the subsidence trends within the Restoration Area. Figure 10-2 shows the
24 calculated annual subsidence rates continue to range from about 0.15 ft/year to 0.75 ft/year based
25 on survey data collected in December 2011 and December 2016, and averaged over a five year
26 period.

27



1
2
3

**Figure 10-2.
Regional Subsidence Map**

1 *DWR Capacity Studies and Analysis*

2 DWR, in coordination with Reclamation, will conduct a study to better understand the effects of
3 long-term subsidence on channel capacity, and the designs of the levee, seepage, and site-
4 specific projects. In performing this study, the 1-D hydraulic models will be developed using the
5 latest LiDAR data collected in early 2015 and additional levee survey data in 2016, and
6 employed for existing and future design conditions considering subsidence for the entire
7 Restoration Area. The future subsidence rates will be based on the average rate of subsidence
8 currently being measured by Reclamation since 2011. Because of delays in the processing of the
9 new LiDAR data, this study is expected to be completed in 2018.

10 In addition to updating the models, and assessing the channel capacity to consider future
11 subsidence, DWR is performing a study within the flood bypasses to understand how subsidence
12 is changing the sediment transport. The study is designed to better understand and quantify how
13 subsidence-induced sedimentation will affect channel capacity over the next 13-years before the
14 larger Reach 4B project is implemented and to provide information on the amount of sediment
15 removal that may be required to maintain necessary design flow capacities. Results from the
16 sediment transport study could provide information to further evaluate bypass flow capacities, as
17 well as refine certain aspects of the design for the Reach 4B, Eastside Bypass and Mariposa
18 Bypass Channel and Structural Improvements Project. The results will be summarized in the
19 2019 CCR.

20 **10.2 Monitoring Activities**

21 The SJRRP is continuing various monitoring activities for different studies and purposes. The
22 monitoring described below will guide implementation of the Settlement for observing and
23 adjusting to changes in physical conditions within the Restoration Area including those changes
24 that may impact channel capacity. These monitoring activities are described in the *Physical*
25 *Monitoring and Management Plan*, which is in Appendix D of the PEIS/R, the *Restoration Flow*
26 *Guidelines*, or the *Seepage Management Plan*. The following sections describe the monitoring
27 that may be undertaken on an as-needed basis.

28 **10.2.1 Flow Monitoring**

29 The objective of continuing to monitor flow is to ensure compliance with the hydrograph
30 releases in Exhibit B of the Settlement and any other applicable flow releases without exceeding
31 then-existing channel capacity. Reclamation, DWR and the USGS currently maintain 23 flow
32 and staff gages along the San Joaquin River and tributaries between Friant Dam and the Merced
33 confluence. These gages are used to determine the flow in each reach of the river. All of the
34 gages shown in Figure 10-3 below are telemetered and available online at the California Data
35 Exchange Center (CDEC). Each of the operating agencies also conducts periodic flow
36 measurements in order to develop and adjust rating curves as necessary. Final daily average data
37 is determined monthly by Reclamation, as requested by DWR, and annually by the USGS. Flow
38 monitoring stations provide calibration data for hydraulic models and a key dataset for

1 comparison and evaluation. Monitoring of these stations would continue as needed to help ensure
2 Restoration Flows do not exceed then-existing channel capacities.

3 In addition to the flow monitoring already being completed, DWR will also develop a flow and
4 channel capacity water surface elevation monitoring plan to evaluate future changes in channel
5 capacity at critical sites due to vegetation, sedimentation, or other channel changes. The
6 objective is to develop a monitoring plan for the critical locations identified in each reach that
7 limit the flow capacity of the reach. The plan will include a review of the existing monitoring
8 stations to determine if they are close enough and adequate for monitoring the critical sites. If the
9 existing monitoring sites are not adequate, new sites will be identified in consultation with other
10 on-going programs so that new stage and flow measuring devices can be installed. The plan will
11 allow the SJRRP to identify when channel capacities are changing to inform when or if actions
12 discussed in Section 9.0 need to be implemented. This plan is expected to be completed in 2018.

13




Figure 10-3.

Current flow gages (purple) and staff gages (pink) available on CDEC

1
2
3

10.2.2 Water Surface Profile Surveys

4

Along with flow monitoring, water surface profile (WSP) surveys help inform the SJRRP of the potential changes in stage and channel capacity as a result of a change in specific or reach-wide conditions due to subsidence, vegetation, channel work and sediment transport. To help with model calibration, in January and March of 2017, additional WSP surveys were completed in Reach 2A, Reach 3, Reach 4A, and the Middle Eastside Bypass during Flood Flow releases between 6,000 and 9,000 cfs from Friant Dam. Additional WSP surveys may again be completed in 2017/2018 for some reaches, depending on flow releases from Friant and model calibration needs.

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

10.2.3 Aerial Photography and Topographic Surveys

13

The purpose of the aerial photography and topographic surveys is to obtain information about the river stage, hydraulic roughness, river width, and bed elevation to assist with scientific studies that would inform the SJRRP about how physical changes in the system are impacting then-existing channel capacities. A number of survey data sets have been collected in this region before and after the Settlement to support the SJRRP. The current topography is based on 2008

14
15
16
17
18

1 LiDAR and 2010/2011 bathymetry. Due to continued subsidence, a new flight of aerial
2 photography and LiDAR was flown in 2015 within 1 mile of all reaches of the San Joaquin River
3 from Friant Dam to the Merced River confluence as well as the Chowchilla, Eastside, and
4 Mariposa Bypasses. Bathymetric surveys were also completed in 2015 and 2016. The data has
5 been reviewed and is currently being re-processed. Once the final processing is completed new
6 terrain surfaces will be created with this updated topographic data and will be used for site-
7 specific designs and to update hydraulic models and studies which could be used to inform then-
8 existing channel capacity. In 2016, DWR also completed topographic surveys along the top of
9 levee in some of the reaches to provide data for comparison with the LiDAR once finalized, as
10 well as to update the hydraulic models. Because of recent flood flow releases and continued
11 subsidence, additional LiDAR may be collected over the next few years, but funding for this
12 effort has not been identified. In addition to the LiDAR surveys, additional surveys may be
13 completed to support other ongoing and future studies related to subsidence, channel capacity,
14 erosion monitoring, and sediment transport.

15 **10.2.5 Vegetation Surveys**

16 The purpose of the previous and future vegetation surveys is to obtain information on the
17 establishment and recruitment of vegetation. This information can be used by the SJRRP to
18 determine if actions need to be taken to address capacity issues as a result of increased channel
19 roughness from vegetation. Annual surveys have occurred since 2011 and future surveys will be
20 conducted annually after flood events as part of baseline SJRRP monitoring. The extent and
21 scope of the monitoring is discussed in Section 10.2.5 of the 2014 CCR.

22 **10.2.6 Levee Monitoring Program**

23 Since the evaluations of the SJLE Project are limited to seepage and stability analyses, and do
24 not include assessment of other levee failure mechanisms, a field monitoring program was
25 implemented in select reaches starting in June 2017. The objective of the monitoring is to collect
26 data on the performance of levees in the Restoration Area with a focus on the levees that are
27 most critical to limiting the release of Restoration Flows. Monitoring currently includes levees in
28 Reach 2B, lower portion of Reach 4A, Middle Eastside Bypass and Reach 4B2. Other reaches
29 may be added as Restoration Flow conditions change.

30 Levee monitoring is being performed by driving on the levees and observing the following
31 potential levee performance issues: through-levee seepage; seepage at levee penetrations; ground
32 surface seepage and boils; bank instability including sloughing, erosion, and cracking; and lack
33 of design levee freeboard. Animal activity or other factors that may lead to levee instability
34 observations should also be documented. If performance issues are seen, information is recorded
35 for future evaluation and observation. This monitoring will occur twice a month during high
36 water events and at least once a month during Restoration Flows. Frequency may change as
37 conditions warrant more or less monitoring. The results of monitoring in 2017 will be reported in
38 the 2019 CCR.

1 **10.2.7 Sediment Mobilization and Erosion Monitoring**

2 The purpose of sedimentation mobilization and erosion monitoring is to obtain information on
 3 sediment mobilization, bar formation, bank erosion, and bed erosion. This information will be
 4 useful for developing studies to determine the impacts of sedimentation and erosion on channel
 5 capacity as well as a key step in consideration of any sediment management actions. As
 6 described in Section 2.2.4 and Response to Comment O-EC-64 on page ii-197 of the Mendota
 7 Pool Bypass and Reach 2B EIS/R, as well as, in the PEIS/R, if unacceptable levels of erosion or
 8 deposition occur in priority locations that limit channel capacity or impact infrastructure,
 9 monitoring could trigger a suite of erosion and deposition management measures. Those
 10 management actions as described in bullet 3 on page 2-52 of the PEIS/R and are as follows:

11
 12 *Channel Capacity - Long-term management actions for channel capacity may include, but would*
 13 *not be limited to, providing a larger floodplain between levees through the acquisition of land*
 14 *and construction of setback levees, regrading of land between levees, construction of sediment*
 15 *traps, construction of grade control structures, or channel grading.*

16
 17 The SJRRP will monitor channel capacity and deposition per the Program's *Physical Monitoring*
 18 *and Management Plan* and the Program's *Sediment Management Plan* in the Restoration Area.
 19 A description of the *Physical Monitoring and Management Plan* and Sediment Mobilization
 20 Monitoring can be reviewed in Chapter 2 and Appendix D of the PEIS/R. Specific portions of
 21 the *Physical Monitoring and Management Plan* relevant to sediment deposition include the
 22 Channel Capacity Monitoring and Management Component Plan and the monitoring programs
 23 identified therein.

24 ***Reach 2B and Reach 3 Sediment Monitoring***

25 Sediment transport monitoring over the last several years has resulted in modeling updates to the
 26 sediment transport model. These modeling tools will provide excellent context for establishing
 27 the baseline sediment condition at the SJRRP's several priority monitoring sites in Reach 2B,
 28 Reach 3 and Mendota Pool.

29
 30 In 2018, the SJRRP will initiate direct and indirect sediment transport monitoring. The
 31 monitoring effort will build on work completed in 2010 through 2012 and documented in the
 32 Technical Report No. SRH-2015-08 *Sediment Budget Analysis of the San Joaquin River for*
 33 *Water Years 2010 through 2012*. At a minimum, monitoring will help quantify the amount of
 34 sediment entering and exiting Reach 2B, Mendota Pool, and Reach 3. There will be direct
 35 monitoring at priority sites within Reach 2B, and Reach 3 and indirect monitoring, such as
 36 turbidity monitoring or hydro-acoustic monitoring, used to further detail sediment transport
 37 processes in the Restoration Area of the San Joaquin River.

38
 39

1 ***Erosion Monitoring***

2 Erosion monitoring of the channel and channel banks will continue to be conducted by DWR to
3 identify levee erosion areas that may potentially compromise levee integrity for consideration of
4 future management actions (e.g., flow reduction, revetment, armoring, etc.). A pilot study was
5 performed on two reaches of the San Joaquin River to test methods and develop a final plan to
6 detect, monitor, document, and report erosion and deposition within the Restoration Area. The
7 plan will be designed to provide proactive detection of hazards prior to incurring damage to
8 infrastructure, property, and communities. The plan will build on analysis of remote sensing and
9 direct sampling techniques included in the pilot study.

10
11 In the pilot study, DWR evaluated three methods of analysis to identify recent bank erosion that
12 may be threatening levee stability, flow conveyance, infrastructure, or property. Two remote
13 sensing methods included aerial imagery and digital elevation maps generated from LiDAR
14 surveys. The third method was Tetra Tech’s (2010) assessment of erosion potential based on
15 bank conditions, proximity to dominant levees, and evidence of past erosion combined with their
16 computation of the bank energy index. An example of the remote sensing method is shown in
17 Figure 10-4.




Figure 10-4.
Channel Surface Differences 2008-2015

1
2
3
4

1 Two areas were targeted: the first was in Reach 1A at Ledger Island, and the second was 5-miles
2 of Reach 3 near the City of Firebaugh. These areas were part of the initial analysis due to the
3 known evidence of erosion at the Ledger Island site and the critical impact of erosion on
4 infrastructure and property at the Firebaugh site. DWR used these sites to validate the methods
5 for identifying and monitoring bank erosion along the San Joaquin River. The results
6 demonstrate that the techniques are capable of detecting erosion at the scale necessary for
7 alerting the SJRRP of problematic locations. These results can be used for monitoring,
8 documenting, and reporting sites where erosion is occurring and its extent.

9
10 As a result of this pilot study, DWR will develop an erosion monitoring plan for the entire
11 Restoration Area to support the SJRRP. The plan should include the locations for monitoring, the
12 type of data to be collected, and the frequency and timing of the data to be collected. In support
13 of this effort, the initial focus will be on the reaches that will convey Restoration Flows in the
14 next 10 years, to provide a baseline prior to major channel improvements being made. DWR will
15 continue to collect aerial imagery and digital elevation maps generated from LiDAR surveys.
16 More frequent supplemental field surveys could be performed in areas identified as sensitive
17 erosion locations and established as needing closer monitoring. Collected data should occur
18 following both flood events and Restoration Flow releases to provide information relating to the
19 timing of the erosion and the flow that caused it. Reports will be prepared to describe the flow
20 effects on channel capacity and potential hazards to infrastructure and communities.

21

1 **11.0 Non-Program Actions and Studies that May Influence** 2 **Future Channel Capacity**

3 There are several entities that are active in the Restoration Area and whose programs may help
4 inform or impact then-existing channel capacity. The SJRRP will need to closely coordinate and
5 collaborate with these entities by sharing information and data, as well as coordinate specific
6 actions along the river that can inform or impact channel capacity. This section provides recent
7 updates of the programs, actions, and studies of other agencies that could impact or allow a better
8 understanding of future channel capacity within the SJRRP Restoration Area.

9 **11.1 Lower San Joaquin Levee District**

10 The LSJLD is a local agency responsible for operation, maintenance, and emergency
11 management of the LSJRFC Project, which is part of the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC)
12 facilities within the SJRRP Restoration Area. The LSJLD operates and maintains levees,
13 bypasses and other facilities built in connection with the SPFC and these actions directly impact
14 the capacities of the reaches in the study area. High Flood Flows in the San Joaquin River during
15 early the winter of 2016 and early spring of 2017 caused approximately 500 feet of bank to erode
16 about 50 feet landward in Reach 2A, approximately 7 miles upstream of the CBBS (Figure
17 11-1). The eroding bank threatened to breach the LSJLD's levee, jeopardizing the adjacent
18 agricultural lands (Figure 11-2). The situation was deemed an emergency and DWR provided
19 design and construction assistance for the rock slope protection repairs beginning on May 22,
20 2017 and continuing through June 12, 2017. The entire project took 11 days to complete,
21 required approximately 11,000 tons of riprap to repair the erosion, and approximately 290 tons of
22 aggregate base to finish the levee the road (Figure 11-3).

23

1



2

3

4

5

**Figure 11-1.
Overview Map of Erosion Project Site**



6

7

8

9

10

**Figure 11-2.
Photo of Erosion Site Prior to Repairs (looking upstream)**



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

Figure 11-3.
Photo of Erosion Site After Repairs were Completed (looking upstream)

11.2 Merced National Wildlife Refuge

The USFWS currently operates a pair of weirs within the boundaries of the MNWR along the Middle Eastside Bypass that could have an impact on channel capacity. These weirs are referred to as the upper and lower wildlife refuge weirs, since they are located at the upstream and downstream intersections of the MNWR and the bypass. These structures have the ability to check water both upstream of the MNWR and within its boundaries for diversion to the various wetlands operated by USFWS. When the boards are placed into the weirs, they have significant impact on water surface elevation and capacity of the bypass, as described in Section 7.0 “Completed Channel Capacity Studies.” Coordination of the release of Restoration Flows and the operation of the weirs will be critical to ensure that USACE criteria are being met.

1 **11.3 DWR**

2 DWR is leading two specific efforts within the SJRRP Restoration Area that may affect or
3 inform channel capacity.

4 **11.3.1 Regional Flood Management Planning**

5 Ten SJRRP projects are included on the Upper San Joaquin River (USJR) Region's project list
6 and the USJR Region has been coordinating with the SJRRP on potential projects that could
7 increase then-existing channel capacities in the Restoration Area. DWR included the proposed
8 management actions that were consistent with Central Valley Flood Protection Program Plan
9 (CVFPP) goals in management action portfolios in the 2017 CVFPP to help identify the
10 investment needed over the next 30 years to achieve the CVFPP goals and intended outcomes.

11 The proposed management actions were also reviewed and assessed against specific San Joaquin
12 Basin-wide Feasibility Study (BWFS) criteria to identify larger-scale regional actions that would
13 fit within the scope of the BWFS. The BWFS is looking at major system elements potentially led
14 by the State or possible State interest in region-wide management actions that achieve the goals
15 of the CVFPP. The BWFS incorporated several USJR Regional Flood Management Plan
16 (RFMP) management actions in its planning including groundwater recharge, subsidence
17 improvements, and flood infrastructure rehabilitation. One project, Firebaugh Multi-benefit
18 Flood Project, looks to provide the city with 100-year flood protection while incorporating
19 ecosystem and recreational elements. The project incorporates existing levee improvements,
20 levee setback and land acquisition elements that could change then-existing channel capacities
21 and benefit the SJRRP. Reclamation recently received a Proposition 1 grant to implement a
22 portion of the land acquisition element of the project.

23 The USJR Region has recently completed the second phase of the planning effort, which was
24 intended to continue the meaningful engagement by the Regional Partners to further develop
25 strategies for addressing governance and institutional issues in improving flood management and
26 implementing projects. Though the USJR RFMP has concluded their work in provided
27 information to the 2017 CVFPP and BWFS, DWR plans to continue the regional planning effort
28 to continue in the future to provide support in the update of the 2022 CVFPP.

29 **11.3.2 Flood System Repair Project**

30 As part of implementing actions in the CVFPP, DWR is also implementing near-term priority
31 actions, the Flood System Repair Project (FSRP) to help Local Maintaining Agencies (LMAs)
32 reduce flood risks in non-urban areas. Through FSRP, DWR is assisting LMAs by providing
33 them with technical and financial support to repair documented critical problems with flood
34 control facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC) in non-urban areas.

35 The objectives of the FSRP are to repair documented critical problems like erosion sites (50-feet
36 in length or less), hydraulic control structures, and deteriorated levee patrol roads. Under the
37 FSRP, DWR recently worked with the LSJLD to upgrade three control structures in the San

1 Joaquin River Restoration Area. The electrical controls and motors for the Chowchilla Bypass,
2 Eastside Bypass, and Mariposa Bypasses were all replaced to upgrade the structures for more
3 reliability and integration with a new Supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) system.
4 The work was completed at the end of 2016.

5

1 12.0 References

- 2 Bureau of Reclamation, 2010. SRH-2D version 2: Theory and User's Manual: Sedimentation and
 3 River Hydraulics—Two-Dimensional River Flow Modeling. Technical Service Center,
 4 Denver, CO, 2010.
- 5 _____, 2012). San Joaquin River Restoration Daily Flow Model (SJRRP) Documentation for the
 6 Reach 4B Study, Technical Report No. 86-68210-2012-04, Prepared for the San Joaquin
 7 River Restoration Program, Technical Service Center, Denver, CO, 2012.
- 8 CA Department of Water Resources, 1985. Flood Channel Design Flows (Modified) May 1985.
 9 _____, Division of Flood Management, 2012. Identification and Prioritization of Levee
 10 Segments for Geotechnical Exploration and Analyses, August 30.
- 11 _____, South Central Region Office, 2013. Evaluation of the Effect of Subsidence on Flow
 12 Capacity in the Chowchilla and Eastside Bypasses, 2013.
- 13 McBain & Trush 2002. San Joaquin River Restoration Study Background Report. Prepared by
 14 Friant Water Users Authority, Lindsay, California, and Natural Resources Defense
 15 Council, San Francisco, California. December.
- 16 Reclamation Board, 1967; amended 1978, revised 1985. Lower San Joaquin River Flood Control
 17 Project: Operation and Maintenance Manual for Levees, Irrigation and Drainage
 18 Structures, Channels, and Miscellaneous Facilities.
- 19 Tetra Tech, Inc. 2013a. San Joaquin River, Reach 2B, Two-dimensional Sediment-transport
 20 Modeling to Evaluate Sediment Budget through the San Joaquin River Bypass Structure,
 21 Prepared for California Department of Water Resources, April 2013.
- 22 _____, 2014. Draft San Joaquin River and Bypass System 1-D Steady State HEC-RAS Model
 23 Documentation, Prepared for California Department of Water Resources, April 2014.
- 24 _____, 2015a. Reaches 3, 4A and Middle Eastside Bypass (MESB) Subsidence and Capacity
 25 Study, Draft technical memorandum prepared for the California Dept. of Water
 26 Resources, Fresno, California, February.
- 27 _____, 2015b. Draft San Joaquin River In-channel Capacity Analysis, Draft technical
 28 memorandum prepared for the California Dept. of Water Resources, Fresno, California,
 29 June.
- 30 San Joaquin River Restoration Program. 2011. Reach 4B, Eastside Bypass, and Mariposa Bypass
 31 Channel and Structural Improvements Project, Initial Alternatives Technical
 32 Memorandum, October 2011.
- 33 Towill, Inc., 2009. Topographic and Bathymetric Mapping of the San Joaquin River from Friant
 34 Dam to Highway 99 (Reach 1A). Letter of Transmittal submitted with mapping to Tetra
 35 Tech-MEI for California Department of Water Resources, Fresno, California, April 24.
- 36 URS, 2013. Channel Capacity Assessment Based on Geotechnical Considerations. Prepared for
 37 the California Department of Water Resources, August 30.

- 1 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2000. Design and Construction of Levees Engineering and
2 Design Manual. Manual No. 1110-2-1913. April 2000. Table 6-1b, page 6-5.
- 3 _____. 2003. Engineering and Design – Slope Stability. Manual No. 1110-2-1902. October
4 2003.
- 5 _____. 2005. Design Guidance for Levee Underseepage Engineering Technical Letter. ETL
6 1110-2-569. May 2005.